

bill. In the first place, it was called up some three weeks ago and discussed, and by the exercise of the most malicious and ludicrous malignity on the part of several Senators they used up the few minutes we had then. It went over a fortnight. Senators wanted to be heard without reference to anything that was pending in the Senate, and this continuous babble about secret sessions and open sessions has interfered with it, and everything that all the dictionary nonsense that it was possible to concert seemed to be combined for the purpose apparently of defeating this pension legislation.

Mr. HOAR. My honorable friend will pardon me—

Mr. BLAIR. I would like a vote on this bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Tennessee has called for the reading of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to hear the bill read.

Mr. BLAIR. That will make three times it has been read to the Senate already.

Mr. HARRIS. If it makes the fortieth time, I ask for the reading.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the bill.

#### INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, being the bill (S. 1532) to regulate commerce.

Mr. CAMDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator from West Virginia will yield to me I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, in accordance with notice given yesterday.

Mr. CAMDEN. I yield.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Before putting the question on the motion the Chair will present a House bill for reference.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 7481) making an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of February 4, 1885, certain information relative to claims of Potawatomi Indians; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution:

A bill (S. 82) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880;

A bill (S. 141) to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," to the port of Omaha, in the State of Nebraska; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 10) to amend the statute in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes, approved June 10, 1880, so that the provisions of the same shall be extended to the port of Key West, Fla., and the provisions of the seventh section of the statute be extended to the port of Tampa, Fla.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 444) to amend section 3336 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

A bill (H. R. 5789) to amend section 2552 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

A bill (H. R. 6637) relating to contested-election cases; and

A bill (H. R. 7465) to amend section 3357 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by section 2 of the act of June 9, 1880, and section 3389 of said Revised Statutes as amended by section 16 of the act of March, 1879.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After three hours and thirty-seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate the 15th day of April, 1886.*

#### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles A. Spofford, to be collector of customs for the district of Castine, in the State of Maine, *vice* William H. Sargent, term expired.

#### POSTMASTERS.

Gilbert W. Farrington, to be postmaster at Monson, Mass., *vice* Arthur D. Norcross, to be removed.

Hiram Foote, to be postmaster at Amesbury, Mass., *vice* J. W. Goodrich, term expired.

Charles N. Perley, to be postmaster at Danvers, Mass., *vice* Joseph E. Hood, resigned.

Patrick M. Shea, to be postmaster at Chicopee Falls, Mass., *vice* William P. McFarland, term expired.

Frank B. Patchen, to be postmaster at Silver Creek, N. Y., *vice* John I. Lamphere, whose term expires April 28, 1886.

#### CONFIRMATION.

*Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, April 15, 1886.*

#### POSTMASTER.

R. E. Goodell, to be postmaster at Leadville, Lake County, Colorado.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 15, 1886.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### AMERICAN PORK.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

*To the House of Representatives:*

In response to a resolution of the House of Representatives of the 6th instant, requesting the Secretary of State "to transmit, if not incompatible with the public interest, copies of all correspondence between his Department and the representatives of France, Germany, Austria, and any other European country which has partly or entirely restricted the importation of American pork," I transmit herewith the report of the Secretary of State on the subject.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, Washington, April 14, 1886.

#### TAXATION OF PETROLEUM IN HOLLAND, ETC.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

*To the House of Representatives:*

In response to a resolution of the House of Representatives of the 17th ultimo, requesting the Secretary of State "to communicate to the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public interest, copies of the recent correspondence and dispatches between the Secretary of State and the minister of the United States at the Hague, touching the subject of taxation of petroleum in Holland and in the Dutch colonies, and that of the export therefrom of leaf-tobacco to the United States," I transmit herewith the report of the Secretary of State on the subject.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, Washington, April 14, 1886.

#### UNITED STATES ASSISTANT TREASURER, NEW YORK.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of force and salary of assistant treasurer at New York, in lieu of estimates heretofore submitted, for the next fiscal year; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### BUILDING, FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS., ETC.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of War of appropriations for building at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., purchase of land at Jeffersonville depot, Indiana, and purchase of land at Neptune Island, New York; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### HORACE P. HOBSON.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the order and findings of fact by that court in the case of Horace P. Hobson, administrator, &c., against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

#### HENRY BAZINSKY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the order and findings of fact by that court in the case of Henry Bazinsky, administrator, &c., against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois, for three days, to attend the funeral of his brother-in-law in New York.

To Mr. MILLARD, until April 24, on account of important business.

To Mr. PIDCOCK, for ten days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. WARNER, of Missouri, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. ELLSBERRY, for ten days, on account of important business.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. FULLER, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the Forty-third Congress the papers in the case of J. W. Habridge, without leaving copies.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution for reference.

Mr. BEACH. I object.

#### CLAIMS ALLOWED BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a privileged report. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to report the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, and to ask its immediate consideration.

The report was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, April 12, 1886.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to transmit to the House a schedule of all claims allowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury since the allowance of those embraced in House Executive Document No. 70. The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for a schedule of all claims allowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury since the allowance of those embraced in House Executive Document No. 70, having considered the same, report it back herewith, and recommend its adoption with the following amendment: At the end of line 3, after the word "Treasury," insert the following words: "Under appropriations, the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund, under the provisions of section 5 of the act approved June 20, 1874."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was then adopted.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa, moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ERMENROUT. I ask unanimous consent to report a bill from the Committee on Military Affairs for reference to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BEACH. I shall have to object. That report can be made when the committees are called under the rules.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent to offer at this time for adoption the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That Saturday, May 1, after the reading of the Journal, be set apart for the consideration in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union of House bill No. 5869.

Mr. DUNHAM. What is the bill?

Mr. HATCH. I object.

Mr. MURPHY. Does the gentleman object if the bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole? I do not understand that he does.

Mr. HAMMOND and Mr. SPRINGER called for the regular order.

Mr. WILLIS. After consultation with a number of gentlemen on the floor, I move to dispense with the first morning hour.

Mr. SPRINGER. I hope that will not be done.

Mr. DUNHAM. Let us have the regular order.

Mr. McCREARY. The committees have not been called for some time.

The SPEAKER. The motion is not debatable. A two-thirds vote is necessary for the adoption of this motion.

The question being taken, the motion was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports to be referred to the appropriate Calendars. The call rests with the Committee on War Claims.

#### ADMINISTRATORS OF S. H. HILL.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5849) for the relief of Henry H. Epping and Alexander M. Brannan, administrators of S. H. Hill; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### T. J. PITZER.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on War Claims, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 932) for the relief of T. J. Pitzer; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### ESTATE OF AYES P. MERRILL.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on War Claims, also reported a bill (H. R. 7878) for the relief of the heirs and estate of Ayes P. Merrill, deceased; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### GEORGE CONWAY.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on War Claims, also re-

ported back adversely the bill (H. R. 4141) for the relief of George Conway; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### ELIZABETH HENDERSON.

Mr. HIESTAND, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 2178) for the relief of Elizabeth Henderson; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### BONDS OF EXECUTORS.

Mr. HEMPHILL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 3189, a bill (H. R. 7879) to amend the law relating to the bonds of executors in the District of Columbia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 3189 was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

#### BOOK-MAKING, POOL-SELLING, ETC.

Mr. HEMPHILL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, also reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 5044) to prohibit book-making of any kind and pool-selling in the District of Columbia for the purpose of gaming; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### LOTTERIES.

Mr. HEMPHILL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, also reported, as a substitute for H. R. 2294, a bill (H. R. 7880) to punish the selling and advertising of lottery tickets in the District of Columbia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 2294 was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

#### MEDICAL EXAMINERS.

On motion of Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa, the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department was discharged from the further consideration of a letter from the acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior in relation to an increase of number and salaries of medical examiners in the Pension Office; and the same was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### BOARD OF PENSION APPEALS—SALARIES.

On motion of Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa, the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department was also discharged from the further consideration of a letter from the acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior recommending that the salaries of members of the board of pension appeals be increased; and the same was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### OBJECTS OF VALUE AND ART.

Mr. SINGLETON, from the Committee on the Library, reported back favorably joint resolution (S. R. 46) accepting from Julia Dent Grant and William H. Vanderbilt objects of value and art presented by various foreign governments to the late General Ulysses S. Grant.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send up the report required by the resolution. The rule requires each bill to be accompanied by a written report.

Mr. SINGLETON. I will withdraw it, then, for the present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can present the report hereafter.

Mr. SINGLETON. Very well; I will do it.

The joint resolution was referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

#### MANUSCRIPT BELONGING TO THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. SINGLETON, from the Committee on the Library, also reported back favorably the bill (S. 1851) establishing a commission to report to Congress on manuscripts belonging to the Government; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. The same order in reference to the accompanying report will be entered in this case as in the other.

#### INTERNATIONAL POLAR EXPEDITION.

Mr. BARKSDALE, from the Committee on Printing, reported back favorably Senate concurrent resolution to print report of international polar expedition to Lady Franklin Bay; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### EDUCATION.

Mr. BARKSDALE, from the Committee on Printing, also reported back favorably concurrent resolution to print 38,000 copies of report of Commissioner of Education for 1884-'85; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. CLEMENTS, from the Select Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 5135) to classify labor and equalize the pay of employes under the Government of the United States; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.



## YACHTS.

Mr. BLISS, from the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 1602) amending the Revised Statutes relating to yachts; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT, ETC.

Mr. CALDWELL, from the Select Committee on the Election of President and Vice-President, reported back with amendment the bill (S. 9) to fix the day for the meeting of the electors of President and Vice-President, and to provide for and regulate the counting of the votes for President and Vice-President, and the decision of questions arising thereon; which were referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## THOMAS R. WARE.

Mr. TUCKER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back the bill (H. R. 7881) to remove the political disabilities of James R. Ware, of Virginia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I have been directed by the Committee on the Judiciary to report back adversely the memorial of John McC. Perkins for the impeachment of Thomas L. Nelson, judge of the district court of the United States, Massachusetts. And I have thought it proper to call the attention of the House to it before I move to lay the memorial on the table, which I now do.

The memorial was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

## PROOF OF LOYALTY.

Mr. OATES, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 3184, a bill (H. R. 7882) to repeal in part and to limit sections 3480 and 4716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read a first and second time, referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 3184 was laid on the table.

## CAPTURED AND ABANDONED PROPERTY ACTS.

Mr. CULBERSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back, as a substitute for H. R. 4305, a bill (H. R. 7883) in relation to claims arising under the provisions of captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 4305 was laid on the table.

## ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBTREASURY, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mr. MCCREARY, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, reported back with favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 902) establishing a subtreasury at Louisville, Ky.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## INSPECTION OF LIVE STOCK, ETC.

Mr. DUNHAM, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back with favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 3899) to provide for the inspection of live stock, hog-products, and dressed meats, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## BUSINESS FROM COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. HATCH submitted the following resolution; which was read, referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That Tuesday, the 27th day of April, 1886, after the second call of committees, be set apart for the consideration of such business as may be presented by the Committee on Agriculture; this order not to interfere with general appropriation or revenue bills; and, whether interfered with or not, shall be a continuing order until the bills presented by said committee shall be disposed of.

## ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. MCCREARY, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported back with adverse recommendation joint resolutions and a bill of the following titles; which were severally ordered to be laid on the table, and the accompanying reports printed, namely:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 14) requesting the President to invite the co-operation of the governments of American nations in securing the establishment of free commercial intercourse among those nations and an American customs union;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 94) to authorize the President of the United States to invite the autonomic governments of America to send delegates to an international American congress to arrange for the arbitration of all national differences; and

A bill (H. R. 5444) for the encouragement of closer commercial relations in the interests of the perpetuation of peace between the United States and the Republics of Mexico and Central and South America and the Empire of Brazil.

## INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

Mr. MCCREARY, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, also reported, as a substitute for H. R. 7267 a bill (H. R. 7884) authorizing the President of the United States to arrange a conference for the purpose of promoting arbitration and encouraging reciprocal relations between the United States of America and the Republics of Mexico, Central and South America, and the Empire of Brazil; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 7267 was ordered to be laid on the table.

Mr. BELMONT asked and obtained leave to file the report of the minority on said bill.

## RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH ARSENAL GROUNDS, PHILADELPHIA.

Mr. ERMENTROUT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 880) granting the right of way to the Schuylkill River and East Side Railroad Company through the arsenal and naval asylum grounds at Philadelphia, Pa.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## KENSINGTON AND TACONY RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. ERMENTROUT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, also reported, as a substitute for H. R. 4243, a bill (H. R. 7885) granting the right of way to the Kensington and Tacony Railroad Company through the arsenal grounds at Bridesburg, Pa.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 4243 was ordered to be laid on the table.

## MARTIN MURPHY.

Mr. ERMENTROUT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 2156) for the removal of the charge of desertion from the record of Martin Murphy; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## JOHNSON S. PRALL.

Mr. ERMENTROUT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 329) for the removal of the charge of desertion against the record of Johnson S. Prall; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. ERMENTROUT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, also reported back with an adverse recommendation the bill (H. R. 670) to authorize the Rio Grande, Mexico and Pacific Railroad Company to purchase certain land, and for other purposes; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. ERMENTROUT, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4446) for the repair of Fort Marion, at Saint Augustine, Fla., and the inclosure of the grounds attached to said fort, and the same was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

## ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. CUTCHEON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with an adverse recommendation bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed, namely:

A bill (H. R. 2125) for the relief of Francis J. Conlan;

A bill (H. R. 1777) to authorize the Secretary of War to correct the record of certain meritorious soldiers of the late war, and to secure to them an honorable discharge from the service, and to provide for the payment of the salary or bounty withheld from such soldiers by reason of their alleged desertion;

A bill (H. R. 5428) for the relief of George W. Meloy;

A bill (H. R. 3952) removing the charge of desertion from the record of John Knockelman;

A bill (H. R. 4613) for the relief of George Henry Parker from the charge of desertion; and

A bill (H. R. 1705) for the relief of W. P. Payne.

## JAMES M. M'KAMEY.

Mr. HOUK, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 5775) for the relief of James M. McKamey; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## DONATIONS OF CANNON, ETC.

Mr. HOUK, from the Committee on Military Affairs, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 3020) donating condemned cannon and cannon-balls to the village of Albion, Orleans

County, New York; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOUK, from the Committee on Military Affairs, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 3021) donating condemned cannon and cannon-balls to the village of Nunda, Livingston County, New York; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. HOUK, from the Committee on Military Affairs, also reported back with adverse recommendations bills of the following titles; which were laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 3553) for the relief of Mannister Worts and others;  
A bill (H. R. 3723) directing the Secretary of War to amend the record of Cyril Greenwood; and

A bill (H. R. 3599) for the removal of the charge of desertion from Marshall N. Murphy, late a private in Company A, Fourth Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

#### CHARLES W. FAUST.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Ohio, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 2704) for the relief of Charles W. Faust; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### JOHN F. S. HARDAWAY.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Ohio, from the Committee on Military Affairs, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 3696) to relieve John F. S. Hardaway from the charge of desertion; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### PHILIP TAYLOR.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Ohio, from the Committee on Military Affairs, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 4727) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Philip Taylor; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### EMANUEL KLAUSER.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Ohio, from the Committee on Military Affairs, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 3887) for the relief of Emanuel Klauser; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### JOHN H. WALTERS.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Ohio, from the Committee on Military Affairs, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 3214) for the relief of John H. Walters; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Ohio, from the Committee on Military Affairs, also reported back with adverse recommendations bills of the following titles; which were laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 3480) for the relief of Desire B. Johnson;  
A bill (H. R. 4065) for the relief of Charles E. Molen;  
A bill (H. R. 4822) for the relief of Charles H. Hammond from the charge of desertion;

A bill (H. R. 4676) removing the charge of desertion against Charles Lowther;

A bill (H. R. 1909) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William C. Jones;

A bill (H. R. 3965) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Bowles; and

A bill (H. R. 3299) for the relief of John Wells.

#### TELEGRAPH OPERATORS DURING THE WAR.

Mr. VIELE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 238, a bill (H. R. 7886) for the relief of telegraph operators during the war; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 238 was laid on the table.

#### BUSINESS OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. HERBERT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported back with a favorable recommendation the House resolution to fix a day for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7635) to consolidate certain bureaus of the Navy Department; which was referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HERBERT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the House resolution to fix a day

for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6664) to increase the naval establishment; which was referred to the House Calendar.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1883.

Mr. BALLENTINE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 2557) limiting a portion of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1883, and for other purposes;" which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. HERBERT obtained leave to present the views of the minority, to be printed with the report of the majority.

#### PRE-EMPTION OF PUBLIC LANDS, ETC.

Mr. COBB, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported in lieu of sundry bills a bill (H. R. 7887) to repeal all laws providing for the pre-emption of the public lands, the laws allowing entries for timber culture, the laws authorizing the sale of desert lands, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas, obtained leave to present the views of the minority, to be printed with the report of the majority.

#### LAND DISTRICTS, NEBRASKA.

Mr. STRAIT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back with a favorable recommendation a bill (S. 1487) to establish two additional land districts in the State of Nebraska; which by unanimous consent was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### LANDS IN RANDOLPH COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

Mr. PAYSON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back with a favorable recommendation a bill (H. R. 334) granting the title of the United States to certain lands to the county of Randolph in the State of Illinois on certain conditions; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### PEORIA AND MIAMI INDIANS.

Mr. SKINNER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 739, a bill (H. R. 7888) to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to united Peorias and Miamis in the Indian Territory; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 739 was laid on the table.

#### INDIAN LANDS IN KANSAS AND NEBRASKA.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back with a favorable recommendation a bill (H. R. 7087) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time of the payment of the purchase-money on the sale of the reservation of the Otoe and Missouri tribes of Indians in the States of Nebraska and Kansas; which, by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### TERRITORY OF OKLAHOMA.

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on the Territories, reported back with a favorable recommendation a bill (H. R. 7217) to provide for the organization of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. BARNES, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to submit the views of the minority, to be printed with the report.

#### PENAL COLONIZATION.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on the Territories, reported back, with the recommendation that it lie on the table, a joint resolution of the Legislature of New Jersey relative to penal colonization; and it was so ordered.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING, NEWBURG, N. Y.

Mr. WILKINS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 1569, a bill (H. R. 7889) to erect a public building at Newburg, N. Y.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 1569 was laid on the table.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING, AKRON, OHIO.

Mr. WILKINS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, also reported, as a substitute for H. R. 5734, a bill (H. R. 7890) for the erection of a building at Akron, Ohio; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 5734 was laid on the table.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING, SEDALIA, MO.

Mr. WADE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,



reported, as a substitute for H. R. 1376, a bill (H. R. 7891) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Sedalia, in the State of Missouri; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 1376 was laid on the table.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING AT HELENA, MONT.

Mr. HENLEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2885) for the erection of a public building at Helena, Mont.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING AT PETERSBURG, VA.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably the bill (S. 480) for the improvement and enlargement of the public building at Petersburg, Va.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### INVESTIGATION OF PACIFIC RAILROADS.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on Pacific Railroads, reported, as a substitute for the resolution (Mis. Doc. 142) directing an investigation of books, accounts, &c., of the Union Pacific Railroad, a resolution (Mis. Doc. 225) authorizing an investigation of books and accounts and systems of accounts of the Pacific railroads which have been aided by the United States Government; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### LOUISA C. BEEZELEY.

Mr. MATSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 576) for the relief of Elizabeth C. Beezeley; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### JOHN M'GOWAN.

Mr. LOVERING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4032) granting a pension to John McGowan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### NELSON MONROE.

Mr. LOVERING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 6088) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Monroe; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### CHARLES SCHULER.

Mr. O'HARA, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7298) for the relief of Charles Schuler; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### RANDOLPH SEAMAN.

Mr. O'HARA, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7300) for the relief of Randolph Seaman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### CALLIE WEST.

Mr. O'HARA, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7222) granting a pension to Callie West; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### ISAAC N. HAWKINS.

Mr. O'HARA, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 7519) to increase the pension of Isaac N. Hawkins; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### MRS. MARGARET COLBATH.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 1585) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Colbath; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### SARAH A. VAUGHN.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 1592) for the relief of Sarah A. Vaughn; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### SAMANTHA A. SMITH.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6452) granting a pension to Samantha A. Smith; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### MRS. SARAH CASTEEL.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6795) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah Casteel; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### MARTIN J. REYNOLDS.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6453) granting a pension to Martin J. Reynolds; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### SAMUEL ROBBINS.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6650) granting a pension to Samuel Robbins; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### JOHN H. WESTERHOUSE.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6721) granting a pension to John H. Westerhouse, late of Company F, First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade (Thirteenth) Maryland Volunteers; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### MARY S. WOODSON.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7073) granting a pension to Mary S. Woodson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### JAMES D. COTTON.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6117) granting a pension to James D. Cotton; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

- A bill (H. R. 6802) restoring to the pension-roll James Watson;
- A bill (H. R. 6805) to increase the pension of Michael Wetzel;
- A bill (H. R. 6497) granting a pension to Charles H. Walford; and
- A bill (H. R. 7085) granting a pension to Archibald Mathews.

#### ROBERT CHAWNER.

On motion of Mr. MORRILL, by unanimous consent, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6719) to pension Robert Chawner; and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. PINDAR, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6532) for the relief of the widow of the late Lieut. Col. Joseph A. Haskin, United States Army; and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

On motion of Mr. PINDAR, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5343) for the relief of Thomas Smith; and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### ANTOINETTE BIRNEY.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7156) to increase the pension of Antoinette Birney, widow of Maj. Gen. David B. Birney; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### MARY A. THOMAS.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6747) granting a pension to Mary A. Thomas; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### REBECCA ALLEN.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5645) granting a pension to Rebecca Allen; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### NANCY R. BROWN.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 1997) granting a pension to Nancy R. Brown; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

- A bill (H. R. 5753) granting a pension to Eliza E. Berry; and
- A bill (H. R. 2126) granting a pension to Mary E. Bryant.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. SWOPE, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4800) for the relief of Matilda Caldwell, late Matilda Sparks; and the same was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. ZACH. TAYLOR, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

- A bill (H. R. 5318) for the relief of John Sturgis; and
- A bill (H. R. 5666) granting a pension to Arnold Carey.

## NAVY PENSIONS, ETC.

Mr. HUTTON, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4702) amending sections 4756 and 4757 of the Revised Statutes relating to pensions to certain disabled persons who have served in the Navy or Marine Corps; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

## ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. LANDES, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 2592) for the relief of William H. Deery; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

## HENRY H. SIBLEY.

Mr. TRIGG, from the Committee on Claims, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 2485) for the relief of Henry H. Sibley; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUCHANAN submitted the views of the minority; which were ordered to be printed with the majority report.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. SPRINGER, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1898) for the relief of the heirs of Martin Webb, deceased; and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

## ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. BARBOUR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

- A bill (H. R. 407) for the relief of the Adis Israel Hebrew congregation of the city of Washington, D. C.; and
- A bill (H. R. 2194) to exempt the property of the Young Men's Christian Association of Washington, D. C., from taxation.

## LOUISVILLE AND PORTLAND CANAL BASIN.

Mr. BROWN, of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 4927, a bill (H. R. 7892) authorizing the use of the Louisville and Portland Canal Basin, upon certain conditions; which was read a first and second time, referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 4927 was laid on the table.

## YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN HOME, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GAY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7083) to incorporate the trustees of the Young Women's Christian Home, in Washington, D. C.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## MONUMENT TO U. S. GRANT.

Mr. STAHLNECKER, from the Committee on the Library, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1564) for the erection of a monument to the late Ulysses S. Grant; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## SAMUEL NOBLE.

Mr. OATES, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported a bill (H. R. 7893) to remove the bar of the statute of limitations, that Samuel Noble may prosecute a cotton claim before the Court of Claims; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS.

Mr. BENNETT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported, as a substitute for the bill H. R. 7549, a bill (H. R. 7894) to amend the internal-revenue laws; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. NEECE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill (H. R. 7632) to establish a light-ship off the entrance to the Chesapeake Bay; when the Speaker signed the same.

## INDIAN COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER. The next business is the call of committees for the consideration of bills; and the pending question is on a bill (H. R. 6973) to provide for the appointment of a commission to inspect and report on the condition of Indians, Indian affairs, and for other purposes, which comes over from a previous morning hour.

Mr. HOLMAN rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana has sixteen minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is, of the first hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has sixteen minutes of his time. There is one hour afterward.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. I would ask the gentleman if this can not be passed over by unanimous consent until to-morrow, retaining its place without prejudice?

Mr. MORRISON. No; to-morrow is private bill day.

Mr. HOLMAN. I will state that a request has been made by gentlemen connected with the Committee on Territories that this bill should be allowed to go over to a later date, Tuesday, perhaps, of next week is the latest, without losing its place under the call. If we can have the right of way on Tuesday for the consideration of the bill I shall make no objection to the request for the purpose of accommodating the gentlemen who make this suggestion. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over, to be entitled to consideration for one hour on Tuesday in the usual time.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. HOLMAN. I further request that any gentlemen who desire to propose amendments to the bill may be permitted to present them and have them considered as pending.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL 6973.

Mr. HOLMAN moved the following amendments to House bill 6973:

- First. Fill up the blank in line 6, first section, with the word "major."
- Second. Fill up the blank in third line of the fifth section with the word "ten," and in the fourteenth line of same section with the words "ten thousand."
- Third. In line 16 of fifth section, after the word "commission," the following words: "not drawing salaries, nine thousand."
- Fourth. Strike out the word "five," after the word "twenty," in twenty-second line of the fifth section.

By Mr. CUTCHEON:

1. Amend the title of the bill to read as follows: "A bill to provide for reorganizing and further defining the duties of the Board of Indian Commissioners, and for other purposes."
2. Amend section 1 of said bill so that it shall read as follows: "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to reorganize the Board of Indian Commissioners, so as to make it to consist of seven persons, two of whom may be detailed from the officers of the Army, who shall report to the Secretary of the Interior for duty, the other members to be appointed from the existing board, from civil life, or detailed from officers in the service of the Department of the Interior. And when said Board of Indian Commissioners shall be so appointed, the organization and functions of the present Board of Indian Commissioners shall cease and determine. It shall be the duty of the said reorganized Board of Indian Commissioners to perform all duties heretofore intrusted to and performed by the Board of Indian Commissioners; and they shall inspect all goods and supplies purchased for the Indian service, and advise the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in regard to the purchase of such goods and supplies. It shall also be the duty of said commissioners, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to inspect from time to time, as he may require, the condition of the Indians of the various tribes and bands on the different reservations under the care, control, or jurisdiction of the United States."

## CONTESTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I am authorized by the Committee on Elections to call up the bill (H. R. 6637) relating to contested elections and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That section 127 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be so amended as to read as follows:

"All officers taking testimony to be used in a contested-election case, whether by deposition or otherwise, shall, when the taking of the same is completed, and without unnecessary delay, certify and carefully seal and immediately forward the same, by mail or by express, addressed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, D. C.; and shall also indorse upon the envelope containing such deposition or testimony the name of the case in which it is taken, together with the name of the party in whose behalf it is taken, and shall subscribe such indorsement."

"The Clerk of the House of Representatives, upon the receipt of such deposition or testimony, shall file the same with the clerk of the Committee on Elections. As soon as all the testimony relating to any case is received by the clerk of the Committee on Elections he shall notify the contestant and the contestee by registered letter through the mails to appear at the committee-room at the Capitol, in person or by attorney, at a reasonable time to be named, not exceeding twenty days from the mailing of such letter, for the purpose of being present at the opening of the sealed packages of testimony and of agreeing upon the parts thereof to be printed. Upon the day appointed for such meeting the clerk of the committee shall proceed to open all the packages of testimony in the case in the presence of the parties or their attorneys, and such portions of the testimony as the parties may agree to have printed shall be printed by the Public Printer, under the direction of the clerk of the committee; and in case of disagreement between the parties as to the printing of any portion of the testimony, the said clerk shall determine whether such portion of the testimony



shall be printed; and the said clerk shall prepare a suitable index to be printed with the record.

"If either party, after having been duly notified, shall fail to attend, by himself or by an attorney, the clerk of the committee shall proceed to open the packages, and shall cause such portions of the testimony as he shall be of opinion ought to be printed.

"He shall carefully seal up and preserve the portions of the testimony not printed, as well as the other portions, when returned from the Public Printer, and lay the same before the Committee on Elections at the earliest opportunity. As soon as the testimony in any case is printed, the clerk of the Committee on Elections shall forward by mail, if desired, two copies thereof to the contestant and the same number to the contestee, and shall notify the contestant to file with the clerk of the committee within thirty days a brief of the facts and the authorities relied on to establish his case. The clerk of the committee shall forward by mail two copies of the contestant's brief to the contestee, with like notice.

"Upon receipt of the contestee's brief the clerk shall forward two copies thereof to the contestant, who may, if he desires, reply to new matter in the contestee's brief within like time. All briefs shall be printed at the expense of the parties respectively, and shall be of like folio as the printed record; and sixty copies thereof shall be filed with the clerk of the committee."

Sec. 2. That the clerk of the Committee on Elections shall hold his office until his successor is appointed and qualified. He shall receive for his services \$2,000 per annum; and he shall prepare, when directed by the committee, for publication, a digest of election cases, but shall not be entitled to additional compensation therefor.

Mr. TURNER. I ask that the report be also read.

The report (by Mr. TURNER) is as follows:

The Committee on Elections, to whom was referred the bill relating to contested elections (H. R. 6637), have had the same under consideration, and recommend its passage.

By the present practice the printing of the evidence and preparation of the briefs in contested elections can not be done until the Committee on Elections is appointed and organized.

The object of this bill is to have the evidence printed and the briefs filed before the new Congress meets. By this arrangement it is believed that the work of the committee can be advanced at least two months, and the titles to the disputed seats can be determined before the other business of the House is ready for consideration.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to supply an omission which was made in the draught of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of line 37, section 1, the following words: "And the notice of contest and the answer of the sitting member shall also be printed with the record."

Mr. SPOONER. I desire to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question, with his permission.

Mr. TURNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPOONER. I want to inquire if the Committee on Elections consider, if this bill be enacted into a law, it will be effective in securing the taking of testimony in the manner there provided?

Mr. TURNER. Has the gentleman concluded his question?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TURNER. I desire to state in reply to the gentleman from Rhode Island that this bill does not attempt to alter in any respect the present statute governing election contests, except in the particular that it requires the printing of the record by the Public Printer before the new Congress commences, and for that purpose I think the bill will be thoroughly effectual.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. TURNER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### REAPPRAISEMENT OF CERTAIN IMPORTED MERCHANDISE.

Mr. HEWITT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Ways and Means I ask immediate consideration of a resolution on the House Calendar, reported from that committee, in regard to the reappraisal of imported merchandise.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to proceed to hear and determine the charges made by L. Lehmann, as he was proceeding to do at the time of the passage of the resolution of the House, and that he report the result thereof to the House of Representatives at the earliest possible date consistent with a proper determination of the question at issue.

Mr. HEWITT. There is a report also preceding this resolution, which I ask to have read.

The report (by Mr. HEWITT) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Ways and Means have had under consideration the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitted in response to a resolution of the House, adopted December 21, 1885, calling for copies of letters and documents relating to the application of L. Lehmann for a reappraisal of certain imported merchandise. They find that Lehmann has filed charges with the Secretary of the Treasury that there was collusion between the examiner and merchant appraiser in this case, by which his invoice was fraudulently raised, and he was compelled to pay duties not lawfully imposed by statute. They find further that the Secretary of the Treasury informed Lehmann that he had no power to set aside a reappraisal, unless it could be clearly shown that the appraising officers acted unlawfully or dishonestly.

It appears further that on the 26th of December Lehmann notified the Secretary of the Treasury that he was prepared to furnish proof of fraud or of a fraudulent conspiracy between the merchant appraiser and certain custom-house offi-

cers at the port of New York in respect to the appraisement and reappraisal of the merchandise in controversy.

Meanwhile, to wit, on the 21st of December, the House passed the resolution calling for the letters and documents in the case, whereupon Lehmann was informed by the Secretary of the Treasury that, pending the investigation of Congress, no further action would be taken by the Secretary in reference to his offer to prove fraud.

The committee are of opinion that a resolution calling for letters and documents ought not to delay or hinder an investigation by the Department of charges of fraud against its officials. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution.

Mr. HEWITT. Unless some further information is demanded with respect to this resolution, I move that it be put upon its passage. It is unanimously reported from the Committee on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HEWITT moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### IMPORTATION OR LANDING OF MACKEREL.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to call up the bill (H. R. 5538) relating to the importing of mackerel caught during the spawning season. This is on the House Calendar, and the report is No. 343.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I now move to postpone the further consideration of this bill to the 18th day of May, after the second call of committees.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Arkansas desire to fix the hour? However, he will have control of that matter himself, in the event of the adoption of his motion, and can call it up at any time during that day.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I do not know that this committee will be called at that time.

The SPEAKER. The right of consideration would not be affected by that. Whether the committee is called or not the gentleman could call it up any time during the day.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Could its consideration be postponed simply to the 18th day of May and then be called up at any time during the day?

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Arkansas, if adopted, would make it in order to call it up at any time on that day.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas to postpone the further consideration of this bill to the time fixed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, moved to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### PORT OF OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I call up from the House Calendar the bill (S. 141) to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," to the port of Omaha, in the State of Nebraska.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That the privileges of immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise conferred by the act of June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," be, and the same are hereby, extended to the port of Omaha, in the State of Nebraska, as provided for as to the ports mentioned in section 7 of said act.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I will only say the committee addressed a communication to the Secretary of the Treasury, and he advised this extension of the privileges of the act to the port of Omaha be granted. Unless some gentleman wishes to make some inquiries or remarks I will ask for a vote on the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### PORTS OF PORTLAND AND PORT TOWNSEND.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I call up for consideration the bill (S. 82) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That the privileges of the first section of the act approved June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," be, and the same are hereby, extended to the port of Portland, Oreg.; and that the privileges of the first and seventh sections of said act be, and the same are hereby, extended to the port of Port Townsend, in Washington Territory.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### PORTS OF KEY WEST AND TAMPA.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I call up for consideration the joint resolution (S. R. 10) to amend the statute in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes, approved June 10, 1880, so that the provisions of the same shall be extended to the port of Key West, Fla., and the provisions of the seventh section of the statute be extended to the port of Tampa, Fla.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

*Resolved, &c., That the provisions of the first and seventh sections of the act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880, be extended to the port of Key West, Fla.; and that the provisions of the seventh section of the same act be extended to Tampa, Fla. And all the other provisions of said act shall apply to both said ports and to all goods and merchandise therein mentioned.*

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I call up for consideration the bill H. R. 4007.

The SPEAKER. The bill H. R. 4007 is on the Private Calendar, the Chair is advised. It is to admit free certain articles for the benefit of a church.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does a bill of that character go to the Private Calendar?

The SPEAKER. It does. It is for the benefit of a private institution.

Mr. SPRINGER. But it has relation to the revenue.

The SPEAKER. So has every bill which appropriates money; but if it is for the benefit of a private individual or corporation it is a private bill.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Is it in order to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of this bill?

The SPEAKER. Not in this hour, because this hour is devoted to business of a particular class.

#### BONDS OF BREWERS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I am directed by the Committee on Ways and Means to call up for consideration from the House Calendar the bill (H. R. 444) to amend section 3336 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c., That section 3336 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:*

"SEC. 3336. Every brewer, on filing notice as aforesaid of his intention to commence or continue business, shall execute a bond to the United States, to be approved by the collector of the district, in a sum equal to three times the amount of the tax which, in the opinion of the collector, said brewer will be liable to pay during any one month, and conditioned that he shall pay, or cause to be paid, as herein provided, the tax required by law on all beer, lager-beer, ale, porter, and other fermented liquors made by or for him, before the same is sold or removed for consumption or sale, except as hereinafter provided; and that he shall keep, or cause to be kept, a book, in the manner and for the purposes hereinafter specified, which shall be open to inspection by the proper officers, as by law required; and that he shall in all respects faithfully comply, without fraud or evasion, with all requirements of law relating to the manufacture and sale of any malt liquors aforesaid; and he shall execute a new bond, whenever required so to do by said collector, in the amount above named and conditioned as above provided, which bond shall be in lieu of any former bond or bonds of such brewer in respect to all liabilities accruing after its approval by said collector."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The only change in the law proposed by this amendment is that whereas, under the present law, the brewers give an annual bond for twice the amount of the tax that is supposed to be payable during any one month, this makes the bond a continuing perpetual bond for three times the amount, with power in the collector to require a new bond whenever in his judgment it should be demanded. The act was submitted to the Bureau of Internal Revenue and approved by it as being in every way equal to the present statute and removing an unnecessary burden from the brewer, and removing also the questions that occasionally arise as to the effect of the lapse of time and the failure to renew the bond upon the security. That is the sole object of it. If there is no further explanation demanded, I ask that the bill be put upon its passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### MANUFACTURERS OF TOBACCO.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I call up from the House Calendar for consideration the bill (H. R. 7465) to amend section 3357 of

the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by section 2 of the act of June 9, 1880, and section 3389 of said Revised Statutes, as amended by section 16 of the act of March 1, 1879.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c., That section 3357 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by section 2 of the act of June 9, 1880, be further amended and re-enacted so as to read as follows:*

"Every collector shall keep a record, in a book or books provided for the purpose, to be open to the inspection of only the proper officers of internal revenue, including deputy collectors and internal-revenue agents, of the name and residence of every person engaged in the manufacture of tobacco or snuff in his district, the place where such manufacture is carried on, and the number of the manufactory; and he shall enter in said record, under the name of each manufacturer, a copy of every inventory required by law to be made by such manufacturer, and an abstract of his monthly returns; and he shall cause the several manufactories of tobacco or snuff in his district to be numbered consecutively, which numbers shall not be thereafter changed, except for reasons satisfactory to himself and approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue."

SEC. 2. That section 3389 of said Revised Statutes, as amended by section 16 of the act of March 1, 1879, be further amended and re-enacted so as to read as follows:

"Every collector shall keep a record, in a book provided for that purpose, to be open to the inspection of only the proper officers of internal revenue, including deputy collectors and internal-revenue agents, of the name and residence of every person engaged in the manufacture of cigars in his district, the place where such manufacture is carried on, and the number of the manufactory; and he shall enter in said record, under the name of each manufacturer, an abstract of his inventories and monthly returns; and he shall cause the several manufactories of cigars in the district to be numbered consecutively, which number shall not thereafter be changed."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The sole change that is made by this bill in the present statute law is that in each of the sections as they stand now are the words, "to be open to the inspection of any person." Under the law as it now is, the manufacturers of snuff, tobacco, and cigars are compelled to file certain schedules, inventories, and reports, which taken together reveal all their private business, and the formulas under and by which all their manufactures are made, and which, if examined by a competitor or rival, give to that competitor or rival all the business secrets of the manufacturer. The committee did not think the Government ought to go partners in this improper sort of business method, and give to others the means of obtaining this secret information. They have therefore simply stricken out the words "to be open to the inspection of any person," and inserted the words, "to be open to the inspection of only the proper officers of internal revenue, including deputy collectors and internal-revenue agents;" this particular clause having been draughted by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as being entirely ample for the purposes of revenue. If there is no further explanation desired, I shall ask that the bill be put upon its passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### PORT OF ENTRY, CAPE CHARLES CITY.

Mr. HEWITT. I am instructed by the Committee of Ways and Means to call up House bill No. 5789, to amend section 2552 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c., That paragraph 1 of section 2552 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended by striking out "Cherry-stone," in the sixth line, and inserting in lieu thereof "Cape Charles City;" so that it will read "Cape Charles City shall be the port of entry," &c.*

Mr. HEWITT. This bill changes the port of entry from Cherry-stone to Cape Charles City, because a railroad has been constructed and a new terminus made. It is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Has the bill been reported from the committee?

Mr. HEWITT. It has been duly reported and the report filed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HEWITT moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### EXPORT TOBACCO MANUFACTORIES AND DRAWBACK.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee of Ways and Means to call up from the Calendar the bill (H. R. 2522) to authorize the establishment of export tobacco manufactories, and for drawback upon imported articles used in manufacturing exported tobacco.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, as there is not much time left to be occupied by this committee, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House without going to the Committee of the Whole. This will give us further time, so that we may complete or rather pass the bill.

The SPEAKER. There are twenty-two minutes left. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORRISON] asks unanimous consent that the bill indicated be considered in the House without going to the Committee of the Whole.



Mr. MCADOO. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to offer to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The course proposed will not prevent that unless the previous question is demanded and ordered by the House.

The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill as above.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORRISON] moves that the Committee of the Whole be discharged from the further consideration of the bill the title of which has just been read, and that the bill be considered in the House.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c.*, That it shall be lawful to establish export-tobacco manufacturing for the manufacture of tobacco exclusively for exportation, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; and that the provisions of section 3433 of the United States Revised Statutes, and sections 14 and 15 of the act of May 28, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the laws in relation to internal revenue," so far as applicable, shall be in force in respect to such export tobacco manufacturing; and that the same drawback shall be allowed to a manufacturer who shall use sugar or molasses in his export tobacco manufacturing upon which an import duty has been paid that would be allowed under existing laws to a person exporting the same, such drawback to be allowed and paid as now provided for by law.

Sec. 2. That exports of manufactured tobacco not produced in export tobacco manufacturing shall be entitled to a drawback of 90 per cent. of the duty upon such imported articles as are actually used in the manufacture of such exported tobacco, upon such evidence and under such regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the reading of the report which accompanies the bill.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 232) to authorize the establishment of export-tobacco manufacturing, report:

That the committee have had said bill under consideration, and find that for many years a large business has been done in the exportation of manufactured tobacco; that at this time more than 10,000,000 pounds per annum of tobacco manufactured in the United States is exported for consumption in foreign countries.

It also appears that in the course of manufacturing said tobacco large quantities of sugar, licorice, licorice-paste, rum, alcohol, and other articles are used, upon which customs duties or internal-revenue taxes are levied and collected by the United States.

It also appears that these duties and taxes add so materially to the cost of manufacture that American manufacturers of tobacco for export find themselves at great disadvantage in foreign markets in competition with manufacturers of other countries, who are relieved from such duties and taxes.

Upon a consideration of the facts, your committee have reached the conclusion that it will be wise to relieve American manufactured tobacco exported to foreign countries from this burden, as a means of stimulating and increasing our foreign trade in this important article of manufacture.

Your committee call attention to the fact that this subject was referred to the honorable Secretary of the Treasury for his opinion. The Secretary referred the subject to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for his views, and that officer reported that—

"As it is evidently sound policy to favor the exportation of domestic products, I would recommend the enactment of the bill into law."

Secretary Folger, in transmitting the letter of Commissioner Evans, said:

"In further response to your inquiries, I will add that I see no practical difficulties in the way of executing the law if it be enacted, it appearing to be entirely consonant with the existing laws authorizing the establishment of manufacturing warehouses for the manufacture of medicines, preparations, compositions, perfumery, cosmetics, cordials, and other liquors exclusively for exportation."

"The interests concerned are shown to be now quite large, though placed at considerable disadvantage, and it would seem that they are equally as deserving of the fostering care of the Government as the other interests named."

And the bill also meets the approval of the present Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Your committee therefore report said bill back to the House of Representatives, and recommend its passage."

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WISE. The gentleman has kindly yielded to me. I want to offer an amendment to the second section of the bill. I move to strike out, in the third line of the second section, the words "90 per cent." and insert the words "the whole amount;" so that it will read, "that exports of manufactured tobacco not produced in export tobacco manufacturing shall be entitled to a drawback of the whole amount of the duty paid upon such imported articles as are actually used in the manufacture of such exported tobacco upon such evidence and under such regulations as shall be required by the Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. Speaker, I will detain the House but a moment in support of the amendment which I have offered. I approve, of course, of the object of this bill. There are two classes of manufacturers embraced in it. Those who manufacture tobacco exclusively for exportation get under the first section of the bill such imported articles as are used in the manufacture of their tobacco without the payment of any duty. Those manufacturers who are engaged in the manufacture of tobacco for home consumption as well as for exportation are required to pay the duty in the first instance, and under the provisions of the second section of this bill are entitled to a drawback of only 90 per cent. Thus it will be seen that the two classes of manufacturers are not put upon terms of equality. I understand the purpose of retaining the 10 per cent. to be to cover any probable cost which may be occasioned to the Government by the allowance of the drawback. Tobacco, Mr. Speaker, is taxed in three ways. There is a tax of 8 cents a pound upon all manufactured tobacco. The manufacturer pays in addition a special tax and the fees of the

inspector of his tobacco. These inspectors can guard and protect the interests of the Government against the possibility of fraud if this bill be passed. These officers are in the manufactories every day, and they can perform every duty which is required under the provisions of this act, and I can see no necessity for the retention of 10 per cent. of the tax. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that tobacco is already taxed largely. Twenty-six millions have reached the Treasury as the result of taxation of tobacco during the present year, and the object of this bill is simply to enable these manufacturers of tobacco to go to the foreign markets and there enter into competition with tobacco manufactured in Canada, in Australia, and in other portions of the world.

Mr. DUNN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WISE. Certainly.

Mr. DUNN. The general law as to rebate applicable to all other articles exported reserves 10 per cent. to pay the expense of collecting and refunding the rebate. Now, why should we make an exception in this instance?

Mr. WISE. I have already told the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN] that the retention of 10 per cent. is not necessary in this case, because the manufacturers are already taxed (I think unjustly) for the payment of the fees of the inspectors, who can and will perform all the duties mentioned by the gentleman, and the allowance of the drawback will entail no expense upon the Government. In the case of cosmetics and medicines the manufacturers are not called upon to pay the fees of the officers employed to protect the Government against fraud. But the tobacco manufacturers are already taxed to pay the fees of the officers of the Government.

Mr. MCADOO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WISE] and myself represent probably the largest tobacco manufacturing interest in the world. I am entirely satisfied with this amendment. It would be very unfair to the large manufacturing interests of my district if they were compelled to erect separate buildings for making up this export tobacco. The Lorillards are located in my district, and pay I think a million dollars in revenue to the Government every year, besides employing thousands of people. To allow them the same rebate that will be given to manufacturers having separate buildings will be only a matter of justice. To pass this bill as it is now will be to revolutionize their entire establishment and that of the other tobacco manufacturing. It will cause them more additional expense than any possible rebate to meet its requirements. It is not necessary to have a separate building, as the manufacture is now under thorough Government inspection in all its departments; and besides, the bill gives the Secretary of the Treasury full discretion to make all necessary rules to prevent frauds on the revenue. This invidious distinction of one factory against another will derange and damage the whole tobacco trade.

Mr. DUNN. They import in bond, do they not, articles they use in the manufacture of tobacco for export, and therefore avoid the expense of collection and refunding which would exist in the case of a rebate?

Mr. MCADOO. My objection to the bill in its present form is that it would compel these manufacturers to erect separate buildings in which to manufacture their export tobacco, or they would lose the 10 per cent.

Mr. DUNN. That is, if they import in bond articles to be used in the manufacture.

Mr. MCADOO. As they undoubtedly do. This bill will seriously damage many establishments and injure instead of aid the trade unless amended. If a person or company has a large establishment he or they must upset their works; if a small manufactory, the great expense of new buildings must be undergone. Fraud can be perpetrated in the one case as well as in the other.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I desire the House to understand that this bill was maturely considered by a subcommittee and still more so by the full Committee of Ways and Means. The committee has presented the bill to the House without amendment. The bill is a bantling of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WISE], drawn by himself.

Mr. WISE. The gentleman will allow me to say that it was not drawn by myself. It was drawn, at the instance of a very large manufacturer, by another gentleman. I offered it at his request.

Mr. HARRIS. I speak by authority of the superscription of the bill. I know nothing of the details.

I wish to say to the House, as some members probably have not attended closely to the reading of the report, that we regard this as a business proposition solely in the interest of the exportation of manufactured tobacco to other countries. We are satisfied that those who are engaged in the manufacture of tobacco for export have resting upon them an incubus of taxation which does not apply to manufacturers in foreign countries; and the result, in one instance, has been to drive out of the city of Danville a capitalist having in plant and fixtures for the manufacture of tobacco for export several hundred thousand dollars. He has had to turn his back upon his home and move his establishment to Australia. This is the effect of this incubus as it attaches to all articles manufactured in this country for export.

Mr. DUNN. I did not know the tariff increased the price of anything.

Mr. HARRIS. That is a debatable question, and we remand it to a future day. I simply wanted to make this explanation in justification

of the Committee on Ways and Means, who reported the bill, I believe, without dissent.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman will allow me to say I think this bill is right in principle, but I would like to inquire, why not extend it to all other manufacturing operations? There is a bill, I think, before the committee to that effect.

Mr. MORRISON. Well, neither the world nor all export manufacturing interests were created in a day. So let us do a little at a time. We are going just as fast as we can. This measure has merit, it is plain, and may be passed in the hour allotted and but a small part of which is left to us.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] has said about all I care to say. I wish to add, however, that our friend from Virginia [Mr. WISE] is rather hard to please in all that relates to tobacco. I did suppose, when we had reported after mature consideration his bill, word for word and letter for letter as he introduced it and asked us to report it, he would be satisfied; but it seems he is not. He now offers an amendment. His amendment gives a drawback of all duties paid on articles imported and used in tobacco for export. The bill as reported gives back but 90 per cent. if the tobacco is manufactured elsewhere than in an exporting manufacturing warehouse.

Now a word by way of explaining the discrimination made in the bill; I mean this difference of 10 per cent. in amount of drawback. The bill is intended to encourage the building of tobacco exporting warehouses; and where tobacco is manufactured for export in such an establishment we propose to remit all the taxes paid on articles imported and used in the manufacture. Where in any establishment tobacco is manufactured, part for export and part to be sold and consumed at home, we propose to retain 10 per cent. of the tax, so as to encourage the building of export warehouses. The reason is, where tobacco for export is made in the same establishment with tobacco manufactured for home consumption there may be some cheating. The object of retaining the 10 per cent. tax in the latter case is to offer inducement—10 per cent. of the tax—for the manufacture of export tobacco in separate warehouses, where no other tobacco is made, thus assisting in the prevention of fraud, as we believe. The bill also remits the tax on distilled spirits used in making the tobacco exported under the same conditions and limitations as now remitted in case of some other articles made for export.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in my previous remarks I omitted one essential statement. The provisions of this bill are very similar to, and almost identical with, the provisions of a bill reported to the Forty-eighth Congress. That bill was approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the Secretary of the Treasury of the last administration, as this bill is approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the Secretary of the Treasury of the present administration, showing that it is not complicated in its administration, that it is wise in its provisions, and that it encourages the export trade of our tobacco manufacturers.

Mr. MILLS. I hope the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] will allow me just one minute.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is hardly proper for me as the exponent of the committee to stand here and allow their bill to be mutilated in this sort of way. We do not know whether with these proposed amendments the bill will meet the concurrence of those who are to administer and enforce the law.

Mr. MILLS. I hope the gentleman will allow me just one minute.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman indicate to whom he yields?

Mr. HARRIS. I call the previous question on the bill and amendments.

Mr. HISCOCK. Is it in order to offer an amendment to the bill?

Mr. MORRISON. The previous question has been moved on the bill and amendments, as I understand.

The SPEAKER. It has.

Mr. HISCOCK. I hope the gentleman will allow me to offer an amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. Oh, no.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield for an amendment?

Mr. HARRIS. No, sir.

Mr. HISCOCK. Let us have a division on ordering the previous question.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 80, noes 33.

So the previous question was ordered.

The question recurred on Mr. WISE's amendment.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 39, noes 47.

Mr. MCADOO. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The hour under the rule has expired and the bill goes over, the pending question being on the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. SPRINGER. I call for the regular order of business.

#### SALE OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY, CHICAGO.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Illinois will withdraw the demand for the regular order of business until

I have an opportunity to ask unanimous consent in behalf of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to call up the bill (S. 1394) to provide for the ascertainment of the market value of certain property in the city of Chicago, and to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell and convey said property.

Mr. MILLS. Has the other question been disposed of?

The SPEAKER. It has not. The hour has expired, and the bill will come up in the next morning hour.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WORTHINGTON]?

Mr. SWOPE. I object.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. There are two or three gentlemen who were absent when their names were called, and if there be no objection their reports will be received.

Mr. DUNHAM. I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

The DUNHAM. The bill referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WORTHINGTON] relates to a matter in the district I represent on this floor. Is it in order for me to know, Mr. Speaker, what member made objection to taking it up?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWOPE] objected.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWOPE] will withdraw his objection.

#### SAMUEL NOBLE.

Mr. QATES, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported a bill (H. R. 7889) for the relief of Samuel Noble; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### INTERNAL-REVENUE SYSTEM.

Mr. BENNETT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 7549, a bill (H. R. 7890) to amend the internal-revenue system of legislation, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill No. 7549 was laid on the table.

#### SALE OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY, CHICAGO.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I appeal again to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWOPE] to withdraw his objection to calling up Senate bill 1394, to provide for the ascertainment of the market value of certain property in the city of Chicago, and to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell and convey said property.

Mr. SWOPE. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection?

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not rise to object to the measure. The question is one of some importance, and I would suggest, if the bill be allowed to come before the House, some agreement should be reached by which twenty minutes' debate will be allowed upon it.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I think a moment's explanation will satisfy every gentleman it is an entirely proper measure.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does the gentleman agree to allow twenty minutes?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIS. I am compelled to object. Let my friend from Illinois make a five-minute statement, reserving the right to object.

Mr. HOLMAN. It can go over until to-morrow morning after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. RANDALL. There is no objection to calling the bill up with that understanding.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection to that understanding.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WILLIS. So far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned it is ready to go on with the consideration of that bill without any general debate whatever. I move, therefore, that the general debate be limited to one minute.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I make the point, as there has been no debate on the bill, the motion to close debate is not in order.

The SPEAKER. It requires unanimous consent.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I object.

Mr. WILLIS. I ask by unanimous consent, as the copies have been exhausted, there be a reprint of the bill and accompanying report.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is ordered accordingly.

Mr. WILLIS moved that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. WELLBORN in the chair).

The CHAIRMAN. The House resumes the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7480) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and



preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, it is not the desire of the committee to discuss this bill, except under the five-minute rule. I have, representing the committee, made a report showing the rivers and harbors for which appropriations are recommended, and the amounts allotted to each. That report has been printed, and is before the House. The total amount is \$15,120,000; for harbors aggregating \$4,000,000, and for rivers nine or ten millions of dollars. In other words, two-thirds of the bill is estimated for rivers and about one-third for harbors.

And now, Mr. Chairman, having made this brief statement, in order to obtain the sense of the House, reserving the balance of my time if it shall be necessary to use it, I move that the committee do now rise, indicating that my purpose is to submit a motion to limit the general debate.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 114, noes 12.

So the motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WELLBORN reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the river and harbor bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor bill; and pending that motion I move that all general debate upon the bill be limited to ten minutes.

Mr. HISCOCK. I suggest to the gentleman from Kentucky that it would be better to let the general debate run for a short time, at least, before submitting that motion.

Mr. WILLIS. Well, what length of time would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. HISCOCK. I would suggest to the gentleman this, that I think it would facilitate the consideration of the bill if the gentleman would allow the general debate to go on and be exhausted. For my own part I do not think there will be any prolonged general debate. I think in all frankness that this should be done, so as not to let it appear at the outset as if it was an attempt on the part of the committee having charge of this bill to stifle debate. I repeat, in my opinion it would facilitate the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WILLIS. I will state to the gentleman from New York that there is no intention or desire on the part of the committee to shut off anybody from any reasonable opportunity of debating the bill. We have had no intimation, however, up to this time from anybody, except the objection made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON], that any member of the House desired to discuss the bill, and consequently we thought it useless to exhaust the time of the House.

Mr. HISCOCK. Why not let the general debate run for a short time, and then see if there is any disposition to continue it? I do not think there is any disposition on the part of the opponents of the bill to take up any length of time.

Mr. WILLIS. I am sure of that; and if the gentleman will indicate some time when the debate, in his opinion, might be closed—

Mr. HISCOCK. I have suggested that it be allowed to run without limit for a while.

Mr. WILLIS. I will state that in consequence of the illness of several members of the committee and those on the other side of the House some members are necessarily absent, and of course the committee is somewhat embarrassed, and we have not felt called upon to indulge in any general debate, but thought it proper to ask the House to take up and consider the bill under the five-minute rule, which I think will give all of the debate required, because in that manner every paragraph of the bill will be subject to explanation and discussion.

Mr. HISCOCK. I have no idea, as I have already said, who desires on this side of the House to speak for or against the bill; but for a bill carrying such a very large sum of money as this, it seems to me that the gentleman should go back into the committee and see what the disposition of the House is after debate has begun. And I say again that I believe there is no intention or purpose on the part of gentlemen, those who wish to discuss or criticize the bill, to embarrass its passage in any manner; but certainly ample time should be given for its consideration.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman from New York is better versed in these matters than I am, in consequence of his long experience here; and as we have no intimation of a desire on the part of anybody to discuss the bill, I should be glad if he would suggest some time.

Mr. HISCOCK. I do not know that my experience has been longer than that of the gentleman from Kentucky—

Mr. WILLIS. It has been better, at all events.

Mr. HISCOCK. And it is with a view to allowing the debate to continue for a while, and then to get an expression from the House as to the length of time, that I have made the suggestion to the gentleman from Kentucky. That being done, it will not look as if it was an attempt to stifle debate, and I am satisfied that we will make more rapid progress.

Mr. WILLIS. While I appreciate fully the grounds upon which the

gentleman bases his suggestion, I would, in turn, suggest to him that many gentlemen are unwilling to be detained here by a general debate; and if there is to be a general debate, they will naturally want to know when it will terminate and when the bill is to be taken up for consideration. They will ask how long the general debate is to run, and I know, as the gentleman from New York is well aware, that there is always a desire, during the continuance of a prolonged general debate, on the part of gentlemen to absent themselves for convenience in attending to other business, for which the general debate offers the opportunity.

Mr. HISCOCK. I can only say to the gentleman from Kentucky that at the present time I am not advised of the name of a single gentleman who desires to make a speech upon the bill. I do not know that there is one. Likely, however, there may be; and, if so, the opportunity should be afforded to them. I repeat that in my opinion it would facilitate the bill.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Mr. Speaker, the object of general debate on such a bill is to give information to the House and country of the nature of the bill; and the object of continuing debate is to answer points and objections which may arise. It does seem to me unreasonable, before any debate has commenced, to limit the time, because until the subject begins to be discussed nobody can tell what is necessary to be said. Now, surely, the discussion of such a bill as this ought not to be an empty farce. It ought to grow naturally out of what is said at the commencement of the debate and during its continuance.

It ought to be such in its character as to satisfy the House that the items and the principle of the bill will commend themselves to the House and to the country.

Now, we ought not, if we are going to pass a bill like this, to have it followed by the usual tempest of misunderstanding which follows such a thing as this. It does appear to me the wisest course for the House, and the best thing for the country, is to give free rein to discussion within such limits as shall be made reasonable by the House after the commencement of the discussion.

What is the object of discussion except to bring out the points of the bill, to bring out the objections of members, and to afford an answer to them, if answer can be made, or to modify the bill if no answer can be made?

Mr. REAGAN addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The motion is not debatable, but the Chair has permitted these remarks to be made to see if an understanding can be arrived at.

Mr. REAGAN. The privilege of general debate is insisted on by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HISCOCK] and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED]. For what purpose? They both avow they are not prepared to discuss this measure. They have no point to make against it. No one else has proposed to discuss it. Is the purpose simply to delay this House in its business and to show a Democratic House can not get through the public business? If that is it we had better understand it. If the object is to wear out time and delay public business, we had better understand it. The bill has been for a long time printed. It has been accessible to gentlemen, and if any desire to debate it they have the means of knowing its contents, and should be in a position to state their objections. But it is a different thing simply to beat about in the brush to see what objection can be raised against the bill.

Mr. HISCOCK. The words of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] deserve some answer. I shall speak for myself, and I have no doubt the gentleman from Maine can speak for himself. I certainly have not sought to delay legislation at this session of Congress. The gentleman from Texas knows it, and this House knows it; neither by long speeches nor by making any speech when it was not a proper occasion, nor by any improper methods. And I desire to say further to the gentleman from Texas, that this side of the House has not sought on any occasion to delay the orderly, regular, systematic, energetic, carrying out of the policy of the House, if it have one. We have done nothing to produce delay, and if we are to have a long session of Congress, I desire to say to the gentleman from Texas here and now he need not advertise to the country that we on this side of the House are responsible for it.

Mr. WILLIS. Just one word. I accept the statement the gentleman from New York makes in perfect good faith. I do not believe for a single moment that any one purposely designs to delay this bill. That is my personal conviction, and I believe it is well founded. But we come here and no one has offered to debate the bill and a number of members of the committee are absent. If any suggestion in regard to the debate is to be made let us hear it and consider it.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Does the gentleman from Kentucky mean to say that he proposes, with no explanation except what he can make in ten minutes, to present a bill of this sort to the House?

Mr. WILLIS. I will say to the gentleman from Maine, I have presented a report in which I have analyzed the bill from beginning to end. I have no idea the gentleman has done me the honor to read the report or that he will do so. But if he desires to know the contents of the bill he will read that report. But there is no wish on the part of any member of the committee to prevent any reasonable considera-



tion of this bill; none whatever. Let gentlemen, however, indicate some time. If they will say two hours, I will change my motion and make it two hours; and I will say further on the part of the committee that gentlemen on that side can have three-fourths of that time. Is not that fair?

Mr. ANDERSON of Kansas. I will say so far as I am concerned that that is fair.

Mr. WILLIS. Then I modify my motion, and will say two hours.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. And that this side of the House shall have three-quarters of that time?

Mr. WILLIS. I find as to that I have made a suggestion which my colleagues on the committee do not agree to. But I will change my motion so as to give the other side what amounts to three-fourths of the time, by making the whole time for general debate two and a half hours instead of two hours, with the understanding that if that length of time is not occupied in the general debate we will go ahead with the consideration of the bill by paragraphs.

The SPEAKER. The question of a division of the time is a matter of arrangement. The gentleman from Kentucky moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor bill; and pending that motion he moves that general debate be limited to two and a half hours.

The motion to limit debate was agreed to.

The motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. WELLBORN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill. By order of the House all general debate on this bill has been limited to two hours and a half. The Chair would inquire as to the arrangement touching the division of the time.

Mr. WILLIS. I will ask the Chair to stop me when I have occupied twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky will proceed.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, in compliance with the wishes of my colleagues on the committee, I desire to call attention to the amount and character of the appropriations recommended in this bill. I will also very briefly submit one or two remarks of a general nature. I will not stop at this late day to discuss any supposed constitutional objection to this class of appropriations. There is no question now more fully settled than the right and duty of the Federal Government, within proper limitations of economy and public necessity, to regulate and to facilitate commerce by all appropriate public works.

While all political parties are agreed as to this, there are in both parties upright, patriotic, and honorable men who object to bills of this kind unless the amount appropriated is reasonable and the objects national in their character. Our committee submits this bill as one coming within the description I have just stated. We think that it calls for no more than is imperatively demanded by the commercial interests of the country, and we are fully persuaded that the most critical scrutiny will show that both the rivers and harbors which are enumerated are worthy of improvement and a public necessity.

Coming then briefly to the first objection, which is that bills of this character sometimes appropriate for objects that are not national in their character, I desire to call the attention of the Committee of the Whole for a few minutes to an analysis of this bill in answer to that objection. The main divisions of the bill are of course between rivers and harbors. The amount recommended for harbors is \$4,415,500, about one-third of the whole. Considerably more than one-half of that sum, or \$2,705,000, is appropriated for fifteen harbors, the amounts therefor ranging from \$100,000 to \$435,000. The mention of those harbors will answer the question as to their national character. They are New York, Baltimore, Chicago, Toledo, Galveston, Cleveland, Mobile, and other harbors of equal importance and of like dignity.

There are eleven other harbors—such as Boston, Oswego, Milwaukee, Duluth, Erie, Oakland, &c.—the appropriations for which range from \$50,000 to \$95,000 each, aggregating \$735,000. The appropriations for these twenty-six more important harbors aggregate \$3,440,000; that is, over three-fourths of the whole amount are for harbors of the character which I have named and which are set forth in detail in the printed report accompanying this bill, and which I will print as a part of these remarks.

There are fifteen other harbors, the recommendations for which range in amount from \$20,000 to \$50,000 each, and which receive by this bill \$420,000. The remaining harbors, eighty-one in number, receive \$975,500.

Of river and channel items there are one hundred and sixty-five rivers and five channels recommended, amounting in the aggregate to \$10,185,200, which is two-thirds of the whole bill. Of this amount, the Mississippi River from its headwaters to the passes receives \$3,725,000, or over one-third of the whole. Sixteen other large rivers receive \$3,831,500. Two channels, Hay Lake, in Michigan, and Saint John's, in Florida, receive \$——. Adding these sixteen rivers and two channels to the Mississippi River we will have for seventeen great rivers

and two channels \$—, being nearly four-fifths of the amount recommended for such improvements. The national character of these rivers will be recognized from their names, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Illinois, Delaware, Red, James, &c. (page 2 of report), and next as to the aggregate amount of the bill. How does it compare with similar bills, and if larger, is its increase justifiable before the country?

The first appropriation of this kind was in 1802, for the Delaware River, which received the sum of \$30,000. Since then Congress has, with one or two exceptions, voted similar appropriations every year. These river and harbor bills have annually increased in amount, and keeping pace, but not equal pace, with the increase of the wealth, commerce, and population of the country.

Thus we find for the year ending June 30, 1871, the sum of \$3,445,900 was appropriated; for 1872, \$4,407,500; for 1873, \$5,588,000; for 1874, \$6,102,900. Passing to the year 1879, we find \$8,323,700; 1880, \$9,577,495; 1881, \$8,976,500 was appropriated; in 1882, \$11,451,300; for the year ending June 30, 1883, which is the largest bill ever passed by any Congress, the amount was \$18,988,875; for the year ending June 30, 1884, there was no appropriation. For 1885 the amount was \$14,948,300; and for the year 1886—this year—there was no appropriation. Thus it will be seen that the river and harbor bill has gone from \$5,228,000 in 1873, to \$14,948,300, in 1885, being an average increase during the past ten years of one and a quarter millions per annum. This increase may seem great, but we must bear in mind that during an equal period of time—ten years—our population increased from 38,000,000 to 50,000,000.

During the same period of time the increase of exports and imports was \$240,000,000. The increase of aggregate exports of leading articles in 1883 over 1873 was: Cotton raw, \$20,000,000; cotton manufactures, \$10,000,000 (or four times as great); flour, \$34,000,000 (or three times as great); wheat, \$68,000,000 (or two and one-half times as much); and of other articles, correspondingly. These figures give some idea of the enormous increase of production and its corresponding demand for transportation during this period of time.

It may be well, also, to compare the wonderful progress of the railroad system, upon whose exactions this system is intended to be a check. The railroad system began in this country in 1830, when 23 miles were built.

Between 1830 and 1850, 9,000 miles of road were built. To-day we have the grand total of 128,407 in actual operation, whose capitalization is seven and a half billions of dollars. Deducting one-half of this for depreciation, there will remain \$4,000,000,000, as representing the present market value of the railroad system—a system which in 1884 transported over 300,000,000 passengers and 400,000,000 tons of freight. The total amount appropriated for rivers and harbors from the beginning of the Government, March 4, 1789, to June 30, 1886, is \$144,546,008 as against \$4,000,000,000. In other words, the railroads which have been constructed within the last thirty or forty years have cost over thirty times the total amount expended for rivers and harbors from the foundation of the Government.

I need not stop to add that the value of the lands granted to some of these railroads has been over five times the value of these appropriations. The expenditures, therefore, for these two rival systems bear no comparison with each other, either in aggregate amount or annual increase.

In determining what our own country should appropriate for its water ways, it may not be improper, Mr. Chairman, to consider what individual States and other nations have expended for similar purposes. Compare our expenditures with those of our commercial rival, England.

We have 23,000 miles of dangerous coast line on the oceans alone; England has only 1,300; yet in one year she expended in her harbors alone \$15,000,000. Had we expended an amount proportionate to our coast line we would have appropriated the enormous sum of \$270,000,000 for one year, and this would not have included one dollar for our thousands of miles of navigable rivers. Look further at the appropriations which England has made. Ten years ago I stood upon the banks of that wonderful river the Clyde. Converted from a shallow rivulet into a magnificent river, filled with the merchant vessels of every nation, it was at once an index and monument of England's wise statesmanship and commercial greatness.

Up to June 30, 1875, there had been expended on that single river over \$30,000,000, a sum nearly as great as we have expended upon all our rivers and harbors from the foundation of the Government up to the same year. Upon the Mersey River the outstanding debt in 1882 was over \$82,000,000. The breakwater at Portland cost \$5,043,870; at Holyhead, \$6,500,000; at Plymouth, \$7,214,000. These constitute but a small portion of the expenditures in England alone, while in the various provinces the British Government has made most lavish outlays in the same direction. Canada, on the Welland Canal and its branches alone, has expended \$45,115,000. In the same direction of cheaper transportation England expended in the East Indies, up to the end of the fiscal year 1882 and 1883, \$125,000,000.

Not only this, but subsidizing certain railroads the British Government had expended \$741,500,000. The State investment in railroads for the same purpose was \$156,800,000, making a grand total, in round numbers, of \$900,000,000. The Government and State loss on all rail-



roads for twenty-four years—that is, from 1859 to 1883—was \$124,725,000. In other words, England lost as much in twenty-four years in securing cheaper transportation in railroads alone nearly as much as we have expended altogether on our rivers and harbors for the same purpose. France has expended annually from fifteen to fifty millions of dollars, and yet the aggregate length of her water ways is not 7,000 miles, the cost of which has been over \$400,000,000. Upon one of her harbors, that of Cherbourg, France has expended \$100,000,000, or four times as much as our own Government has expended on all the great harbors of the Atlantic and Pacific seaboard and on the great lakes of the country.

Germany has just completed surveys for the improvement of her rivers and harbors and artificial water ways at an estimated cost of more than \$100,000,000. She has also just built a ship-canal, connecting the Luebach Bay with the North Sea, thereby reducing the transportation on wheat 6 cents a bushel. Russia has just completed water ways connecting the Volga and the Don at an enormous expense, which will save in transportation 7 cents a bushel on wheat. It must be borne in mind also, as has been well said by the very intelligent gentleman, Mr. Dore, of Chicago, in presenting these statistics to the committee, that we should consider also the burdens under which these countries labor, their great standing armies, their large navies, their immense national debts.

France, with more than 500,000 soldiers in her standing army, 302 ships of war, and 40,000 marines, at an annual expense of \$160,000,000, and a public debt of within a fraction of \$6,000,000,000, three times the amount our national debt ever was, is not embarrassed, though having only a population of 37,000,000. Germany has a standing army of 445,000 men, supported at an annual expense of \$85,000,000, 91 men-of-war, and 15,000 seamen, at a cost of \$7,000,000, making a total of \$92,000,000—population 45,000,000. Great Britain has a standing army of 181,000, costing \$90,000,000 per annum, a navy of 246 vessels, with 57,000 men, costing \$53,000,000; total cost of her army and navy, \$140,000,000 annually. Her public debt is more than three and a half billions, and population 35,000,000. These are the nations which compete with the United States for the trade of the world.

The United States has an army of 26,000, costing \$40,000,000, and a navy—largely on paper—of 93 so-called men-of-war, costing \$17,000,000. Total cost of our Army and Navy, \$57,000,000; population, 60,000,000. Upon these facts, to secure that cheap transportation without which competition with these nations, as I shall presently show, is useless, will it be thought extravagant, unwise, unbusiness-like to appropriate fifteen or sixteen millions of dollars for these great national works of the Federal Union?

The present bill appropriates a total amount of \$15,120,700, which is within \$52,000 of the last bill making appropriations of this character. That bill, like this, appropriates just 33½ per cent. of the estimates. The bill of the Forty-seventh Congress appropriated 56½ per cent. of the estimates. The estimates upon which the present bill is founded call for \$42,332,100. In addition to the regular engineers' estimates, there were before the committee special reports for new improvements and new projects for old improvements calling for over \$20,000,000 additional. The total demand upon the committee was therefore in round numbers \$60,000,000. The amount allowed of this total is, as just stated, \$15,000,000, or 25 per cent. thereof.

I submit, therefore, Mr. Chairman, in view of the immense amounts expended by our rivals and competitors in trade, in view of the rapid and enormous extension of the railway system and of the larger demands of our increased population and commerce, that the amount asked for in this bill is reasonable and proper.

Another and equally important fact to be borne in mind in this connection is that Congress failed to pass a river and harbor bill last year. For the present fiscal year, therefore, ending the 30th of next June, not one dollar was appropriated. It will be remembered that, while the first bill presented by this committee in the last session of the last Congress, appropriating twelve millions, met with opposition, a substitute appropriating five million was passed with practical unanimity. This was the very smallest amount which in the judgment of that Congress could with propriety be appropriated.

The committee which presents this bill has therefore been compelled to appropriate for two fiscal years.

#### THEORY OF THE BILL.

One of the criticisms usually and easily made upon river and harbor bills is what may be called the geographical criticism. I do not know that any gentleman will feel called upon to attack this bill in that way. I do know, however, that such an attack, if made, is utterly without foundation. I state here, what every member of the committee will confirm, that the question of State lines or district lines was never either directly or indirectly considered in the formation of this bill. For myself I declare now that I could not come within a hundred thousand dollars of stating the amount that any given State in the Union has received under this bill.

I venture to say that no member of our committee, unless his attention has been called to it since the bill was reported, could make any better guess than I have upon that subject. The single proposition upon which we have acted in recommending these appropriations has

been the necessities of commerce. We have not stopped to inquire in what State or district a harbor or river was located. If it needed aid and the facts warranted our action we have given it, and given it as fully as the limits of a prudent bill would admit. We have unanimously regarded this bill as a bill for the execution under the Constitution of great national instrumentalities of commerce among the several States, and not as a bill of distributions, as of a dead man's estate among his heirs. The locality of the particular harbor or the particular river was of no consequence whatever.

Where the need was, where the disease was, there we have applied the remedy, whether it was in the North or South, the East or West, whether in a Territory or in a State, whether it was in a State with a half-dozen votes on the floor, as the great metropolis of New York, or in a State with only one, as the State of Oregon. It is true that some States, like Michigan, have an immense coast line, being 15 per cent. of the whole Union. The demands of commerce are greater, therefore, than in a land-locked State, like Kansas or Colorado. The internal commerce of Michigan is over one-half of the whole United States.

Will any member of Kansas be so unreasonable as to complain that Michigan with its immense coast line has received a greater per cent., if you please, in this bill than his own State? As well might he complain of any other one of the great appropriation bills of this House. Comparing his own State in these appropriation bills with that of Massachusetts, for instance, or Maine, he might criticize and refuse to vote to appropriate for life-saving stations, for light-houses, or fortifications, complaining that Congress had discriminated in favor of these States and against his people. The ready and complete answer to such an unreasonable and unjust complaint would be that the subject-matters of the bill were not included in the territorial limits of his State.

Proceeding upon this theory, ignoring State lines and State boundaries, and considering only the demands of commerce at each point, we took the reports of the engineers as the foundation of our examination, carefully investigated all the facts with reference to each harbor and each river in the country. We examined the original plans and estimates to find out how far they had been accomplished, and the total amount appropriated therefor; we took into consideration the amount of money on hand at the beginning of the fiscal year; and, finally, we inquired into the commercial statistics of the place, because we recognized the fact that a harbor which sheltered a thousand vessels was ten times more important than the harbor which sheltered a hundred, and that the river that bore upon its bosom the commerce of \$20,000,000 was twenty times more important, the necessity for improvement being the same, than the river which bore a commerce of \$1,000,000 in value. Thus availing ourselves of the reports of the engineers and of official documents, we invited and welcomed any supplementary information from any source whatever, whether oral or documentary.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, our committee—and when I say committee I mean all of them, because we referred none of these subjects to a subcommittee—our committee, as an entirety, sitting as a jury, if you please, heard all the testimony and rendered our verdict upon each proposition incorporated in the bill upon the specific and detailed facts presented in reference to it. We therefore laid down for ourselves no cast-iron rule; we were not bound by any regular per cent. In some instances, like that at the Muscle Shoals on the Tennessee River, we gave the full amount asked by the engineer for the completion of the work, and it was a large amount; but the committee were unanimously of the opinion that in an improvement which was so national in its character, and which had been pending since 1830, in which the Government had invested an immense sum of money, and where no benefit whatever could result until the work was open, we thought it wise economy and good business sense to make this investment return something as speedily as possible. There are other instances of a similar character, but I allude to this as being one of the most noted and most important.

And permit me to say further, and to challenge contradiction from any source, whether in the committee or out of the committee, that so far as this bill is concerned the charge so usually bandied about in regard to river and harbor bills, that they are matters of chance, industry, and push—that many appropriations are put in by reason of the activity and perseverance and zeal of members, whether represented in committee or elsewhere—such a charge is not sustained by any fact within my knowledge or the knowledge of my colleagues on the committee. We heard all and treated all with equal and exact justice.

#### INCIDENTAL PRESENT BENEFITS OF THE BILL.

It may not be improper, Mr. Chairman, to call attention to the present condition of the country and to the urgent demand for employment by hundreds of thousands of worthy men, not as a reason for the passage of this bill, but as one of the many benefits which will result from its passage. I repudiate as fully as any gentleman upon this floor the idea that this is a paternal government. I deny that it is either our duty or our right under the Constitution to take the taxes drawn from all classes of the people and distribute them as a charity or to afford employment to anybody who is in necessity in the country. The Federal Government is not an eleemosynary institution. It is not and ought not to become the common almoner for all who are in want.

I do not believe that our Government, imitating France under the

first Napoleon, should inaugurate great works of public improvement simply for the purpose of giving employment to those who can not find employment elsewhere. The cry of "*panem et circenses*" is the cry of imperial Rome, and not of republican, democratic America. But while holding to these doctrines shall we shut our eyes to the terrible facts which environ us? Poverty and want stalk abroad; the fires in our furnaces have been extinguished; many of the largest manufactories in the land have shut down; capital shrinks from investment, and labor is unemployed.

Under these circumstances will any one regret, will we not rather greatly rejoice, if this Federal Congress in the exercise of its legal and constitutional functions, building up and completing these great harbors whose outstretched arms and sheltering wings receive and protect the commerce of our people from storm and from ruin; widening and deepening these majestic rivers through whose veins pours the life-blood of our trade—shall we not gladly welcome the fact that while accomplishing these beneficent and necessary results we at the same time are furnishing employment to the millions of worthy workmen, giving bread to their hungry children, and putting again life and hope and happiness in the darkened homes of poverty throughout the land?

Not, therefore, as an object, but as one of the results of these appropriations, seldom in the history of our country will the passage of a river and harbor bill, in my judgment, meet with a heartier support and warmer welcome than now. Certainly no one will regret if the Federal Government, which so often goes to the people as a tax-gatherer, enforcing its laws and collecting its revenue, to the oppression and hardship frequently of its people—no one will regret that that Federal Government should occasionally, at least, present itself to that people as in this bill in acts of beneficence, returning its exactions as the heavens return the moisture gathered from the earth, to the accommodation, benefit, and happiness of those from whom they were made.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is unnecessary to call attention to the urgency and commercial importance of this class of appropriations. If there was any doubt upon these questions it would be answered by the facts of the past year. We have had pending before the American people during that time many great public questions affecting their honor, their prosperity, and their happiness. The restoration and rehabilitation of our Navy, the adjustment of our external and internal taxes, the further or the free coinage of silver—these and many other questions have occupied and agitated the public mind. But in no one of them has the interest been as great as in the subject of cheaper transportation, involved in the improvement of the rivers and harbors of our country; in no one of them has public interest been sufficient to call together a large convention of even one State or Territory of this Union.

While upon this subject of the improvement of our water ways there has been not one but five largely attended conventions, representing more than half the people of the United States and more than two-thirds of its productive energies.

I have before me the reports of those conventions, at Saint Paul, at New Orleans, at Kansas City, and if any gentleman doubts the fact that our people are in earnest about this matter, let him read the declarations that have gone forth from those great conventions and he will see that the people of the United States are terribly in earnest upon this question of cheap transportation. And, sir, why should they not be? Do we not see yonder in England a movement for the opening of the Suez Canal which has brought directly in contact with the markets of England the cheap products of her great colony of India? Do we not see in Germany and in France the deepening of their rivers and the widening of their harbors and a general effort in the direction of securing competition with the United States? How are we to meet that competition? How, except by widening our rivers and by deepening our harbors, so that vessels of larger draught may pass through them, thus cheapening transportation and laying down the products of the teeming West in the seaports upon our Atlantic coast and in the markets of Europe at 15 or 20 cents per bushel less than they now cost? I have already occupied more time than I had intended, so I will not stop now to read the statistics, but I will incorporate in my remarks the figures showing the great decrease that has taken place in the cereal exports of this country.

Those exports are from sixty to eighty million dollars less to-day than they were this day a year ago. And your people, my friend from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON], are more deeply interested in this question than mine or than those who reside upon the Atlantic coast, because your people are shut in by land, bound up by railroad monopolies, and unless you can offset those disadvantages, unless you can prevent the exactions of those monopolies you are, as you know, their slave, and every foot of land within the territorial limits of your State is mortgaged by their power.

Mr. Chairman, I can not close without expressing to the House, and to each individual member of it that appeared before our committee, my own thanks and the thanks of members of the committee for the courteous way in which they treated us, and we have endeavored, in reciprocation of that treatment, to be just and correct in our dealing with the subject committed to us by the House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. What disposition does the gentleman from Ken-

tucky [Mr. WILLIS] desire to make of his remaining time—twenty-eight minutes?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield now to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], if he desires to go on. If not, I reserve the time.

Mr. JONES, of Alabama. Unless it is agreeable to some one who wishes to oppose the bill—

The CHAIRMAN. Unless the gentleman from Alabama desires to go on now the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON] in his own right.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to express my concurrence in what the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WILLIS] has just said in regard to the desirability of regulating railways by cheapening transportation through the opening of the water ways. Upon that there can be little difference of opinion, I fancy, among those who live in the interior; and, as for myself, no one will recognize more fully the effect which water navigation must in the nature of things have upon railway transportation. It is for that reason that I heartily favor the development of any water way, whether it be by river or by canal, which will have the result of giving to the people of the West, to those growing grain and raising stock, cheaper outlets than are now afforded by pooled railways.

But, Mr. Chairman, while men agree upon a principle, whether it be a principle of law or of theology, it happens often that there is a question about the application of that principle. I shake hands heartily with my friend from Kentucky [Mr. WILLIS] upon the proposition which he has enunciated with respect to the effect of water navigation upon railway transportation, and just because of the thoroughness of my belief in that proposition I have some little difference of opinion with the gentlemen who have framed this bill as to the application which they have made of the principle.

For instance, take the Mississippi River, upon which the central States of the continent will some day largely depend for transportation—I say central, because Kansas is the geographical center of the continent—that river in the future will undoubtedly be of immense value to the whole Missouri River basin. No one can doubt that; and if it were to-day an original question as to whether you should by an appropriation create the Mississippi River or not have it, I certainly would vote to have it.

But, Mr. Chairman, when the Great Architect planned and framed this continent, with wondrous foresight and with infinite sagacity throwing that stream up toward the lakes, throwing the lakes back from the Atlantic, providing by His own grand act those superb water ways, and indicating the future lines of cheap transportation when there shall be a hundred millions or two hundred millions of people upon this continent, one-half of whom will be west of the Mississippi River—when He did that, I recognize that He did something which may perhaps render unnecessary such large appropriations for the Mississippi River as are annually recommended by the Committee on Commerce.

And when He made the broad channel in that river, when He deepened it, when by the snows from the mountains and the rainfalls everywhere in the great basin He furnished the water to wash out that channel, I fancy He did something that might perhaps save the Government of the United States from the necessity of making appropriations to develop the levee system on the Mississippi River. In other words, I do not think the boats will run on the levees, and I do not think the levees will have any material effect either in deepening or preserving the channel.

I recognize, too, another fact—that for centuries before the white race had set foot on this continent the Mississippi River proper was a navigable stream, and is to-day a navigable stream in the sense that it is practically capable of carrying large steamers with large cargoes.

Mr. VAN EATON. I would like to know whether the gentleman meant to say that the Mississippi carried steamers centuries before the white man came here. [Laughter.] I understood him to say so.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I am very much obliged to my friend for calling my attention to that point. If I have made any such statement, I withdraw it out of respect to my friend.

Mr. VAN EATON. I just "wanted to know, you know."

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. No doubt it would be a mistake to say that there were steamers on the Mississippi before the white man came to this country; but as to there being water in this river sufficient to float steamers before the white man came here, that is not a mistake.

Mr. VAN EATON. How does the gentleman know that?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Well, by logic.

Mr. VAN EATON. I just "wanted to know, you know." [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I think that could be proven without much trouble.

Now, the question arises, in my mind at least, whether it is necessary in a bill appropriating in the aggregate \$15,000,000 to make an appropriation of \$3,600,000 for the Mississippi River; and while, as I said, no one on this floor is more ready than myself to favor anything which will cheapen railroad transportation by developing water transportation, yet, when I come to apply that proposition to the Mississippi River, I feel that this bill proposes to give a great deal too much for that river. In a bill appropriating \$15,000,000 to the whole continent it



seems to me an appropriation of \$3,600,000 for the Mississippi River, less than one-fifth of the total, is altogether too much, when, in fact, the Mississippi River to-day will carry all the vessels needed to transport your freight.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. If there are obstructions in the Mississippi River—if there are any points which should be deepened or protected in order to secure navigation—I am willing to vote liberal appropriations for that purpose; but I wish to know beforehand whether the proposed scheme will be effectual—whether if you expend \$50,000,000 or \$500,000,000 in this form of improvement there will be any improvement there at the end of five years from the termination of the expenditure. And I am frank to say, Mr. Chairman, that I regard the utility of the present expenditures for the deepening of the channel of the Mississippi River as, to say the least, exceedingly problematical. I should be inclined to go further, and say that I regard such expenditures very much in the same way as if some one should attempt to fill a rat-hole by pouring water in it.

Mr. VAN EATON. I will state to the gentleman that I have very often filled a rat-hole by pouring water in it. [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Well, I am happy to know that my friend has been successful in that respect—more successful than he has been in some other things sometimes.

Now, there is another stream which concerns especially the States of Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota, and a large group of States constituting, if not the finest, certainly as fertile and productive a grain region as there is upon the continent, and to this stream the committee has seen fit to pay very little attention. I find that the total appropriations for the Missouri River are \$500,000 from the mouth to Sioux City, \$80,000 from Sioux City to Fort Benton, and \$30,000 for the removal of obstructions, making a total of \$610,000. Compare this with the total of \$3,630,000 for the Mississippi River, and it seems to me there is, to say the least, a lack of symmetry in the bill; because the Missouri River, if thoroughly developed and utilized, would furnish water transportation in competition with railways for a section of country that is more populous and raises larger crops than that of the Lower Mississippi.

Another defect in the bill is this: There are points along that river—for instance, Atchison and Leavenworth in my own State, Kansas City and Saint Joseph in Missouri, where there are populous and enterprising cities and where the banks are in danger of washing away. While no one of these points is in my district, yet I understand that my colleague from the first district [Mr. MORRILL] asked that a specific appropriation be made for Leavenworth and Atchison; and I think the gentlemen representing the districts in which Saint Joseph and Kansas City are located made similar applications. They were declined; and there are no specific appropriations in this bill, it being assumed by the committee that these points will be provided for out of the aggregate half million appropriation. Why the committee has reached that conclusion I do not know; probably because of some general rule, and as to many rivers they have evidently followed it, but there are several rivers to which the rule has not been applied.

I read:

Improving Saginaw River, Michigan: Continuing improvement, \$45,000; of which \$22,500 are to be used opposite Bay City.

Here is a specific appropriation. Also—

Improving Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois—

Mr. WILLIS. My friend from Kansas will permit me to call attention to the fact that in the last Congress he, with his colleagues and other Representatives from the Upper Missouri, requested the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to create a Missouri River commission and put the river under that commission, and yielding to their better judgment, although against the judgment of the committee, they created that commission. Therefore nothing specific is asked by this bill. At the Saginaw River there is no commission, and hence the committee is at liberty to make specific appropriation.

Mr. PETERS. Is not there a Mississippi River commission, and why not treat the Missouri as the Mississippi?

Mr. WILLIS. There is a specific recommendation on the part of the Mississippi River Commission for the improvement the gentleman refers to, and that is the only difference. There was no desire on the part of the committee, I will say to the gentleman, to do more than adhere to the commission of your own creation.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. So far as that is concerned I think when Congress creates a commission the House does not part with its right to designate specific points at which expenditures shall be made.

I do not know whether the Illinois River is under the authority of a commission or not, but at any rate here is a specific appropriation:

Improving Illinois River, Illinois: Continuing improvement, \$100,000; of which sum \$5,000 may be expended in dredging the river in front of Peoria.

Here is another one for the improvement of the Ohio River. Is that in charge of a commission?

Improving the Ohio River: Continuing improvement, \$500,000; out of which sum \$50,000 are to be expended at Grand Chain in extending the upper dike downstream and removing rocks and other obstructions to navigation at that locality; also \$20,000 may be expended in constructing or aiding in the construction of such an embankment on the other side of the Great Miami River, near its junction with the Ohio, as may be necessary to confine the waters of the Great

Miami in great floods to the general course of its channel at or near the Ohio, to the end that the formation of the bar in the Ohio River now forming and obstructing navigation may be arrested; also \$30,000 of said appropriation shall be expended in constructing four ice-piers, pursuant to the plans of the Chief of Engineers, at or near the following places to wit: One at Pomeroy, Ohio; one at Middleport, Ohio; one at Gallipolis, Ohio; and one at Ironton, Ohio.

Here is our venerable friend again Davis Island Dam.

Also out of said appropriation for the Ohio River \$5,865 shall be used in operating and keeping in repair the Davis Island Dam; and hereafter the Secretary of War is authorized to make requisitions from time to time on the Secretary of the Treasury for such sums as may be necessary to operate and keep in repair the works at the Davis Island Dam, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Here is the Mississippi River. That I believe is under a commission.

Improving Mississippi River from Saint Paul to Des Moines Rapids: Continuing improvement, \$510,000; of which sum \$8,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be applied to the removal of the rock at Duck Creek Chain, at the Rock Island Rapids.

Mr. MURPHY. The Mississippi River Commission only extends up to Saint Louis.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I am obliged to the gentleman for the information. My point is that whether a stream be under the charge of a commission or not, it is within the province of this House to say that a specific sum shall be expended at given points.

Here is an appropriation for dry-dock at Des Moines Rapids, \$65,000.

Then we have another, which I will read:

Improving Mississippi River from Des Moines Rapids to the mouth of the Illinois River, including the river at Quincy Bay and the removal of the bar at the mouth of Whipple Creek; including also the strengthening of Sny Island Levee where it crosses Snicarte Slough, and other sloughs referred to in the report of Engineer Maj. A. Mackenzie, dated the 26th of January, 1885, which work of strengthening said levee shall be performed according to the suggestions and estimates of said Mackenzie, as set forth in said report: Continuing improvement, \$200,000: Provided, That not more than \$16,500 shall be expended at Sny Island Levee.

Here is another:

Improving the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Illinois River to the mouth of the Ohio River, including the completion of the work at Alton, and, at the discretion of the Secretary of War, the protection of the Illinois shore opposite the mouth of the Missouri River: Continuing improvement, \$500,000; of which \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended in extending the work for the protection of the eastwardly bank of the Mississippi River at Cairo, and the prevention of its wash or erosion, commencing at the southerly end of the present Governmentrevetment work and continuing downstream; and the river commission may, in their discretion, use so much of said sum of \$500,000 as may be necessary to correct the current of the river and improve the channel at Saint Louis.

This latter is a point covered by the Mississippi River Commission. I think the appropriation is wise, and that the channel abreast such a city as Saint Louis ought to be improved, and I hold that this House has the right to say there should be specific appropriation at that point. That being so, Mr. Chairman, I do not see why there should not be specific appropriations for Kansas City, Leavenworth, Atchison, and Saint Jo.

Here in the Lower Mississippi we have an appropriation of—

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the rectification of the Red and Atchafalaya Rivers by preventing further enlargement of the latter stream and restricting its outlet capacity, and for keeping open a navigable channel through the mouth of Red or Old River into the Mississippi.

Then—

One hundred thousand dollars in deepening the channel at Vicksburg by dredging through the bar existing there; but this last-named sum shall not be expended, unless after another examination or survey the commission shall deem it advisable; and if they shall not, then \$50,000 shall be expended in the improvement of navigation at Vicksburg by constructing suitable dikes and other appropriate works.

The only point I wish to make by reading these items, Mr. Chairman, is that the committee has in many instances made specific appropriations where there is a commission and where there is not a commission, and I do not see why there should not be specific appropriations where they are needed upon the Missouri River.

I have no desire in the world to make any factious opposition to this bill. I have not had time to examine it, even to read it, until this morning. My point is that you have given too little to the Missouri River. Representing as I do in part that region of the country, looking to the importance of that stream, I wish frankly to say that if \$600,000 be considered enough for the Missouri River improvement I certainly shall not vote and can not vote for \$3,610,000 for the Mississippi River.

You see this money comes from the people of the United States. It should be expended, and I doubt not the committee desire it should be expended, for the benefit of the people of the United States in a broad, true sense, in an effective sense; and, looking at the present densities of population, looking at the relative industries and products of sections, looking at the value of water navigation to the people of the West, I certainly feel, and I think the gentlemen representing that region all along the Missouri River will feel, justified first in criticising this bill, and second in expressing themselves in opposition to an appropriation of \$3,610,000 for the Mississippi River. I do not think it is a fair divide. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANCHARD. Will the gentleman from Kansas permit a question?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. With pleasure.

Mr. BLANCHARD. It is a fact—I make the statement—it is a fact

that the amount appropriated in this bill for the Missouri River is greater in proportion, according to the estimates of the engineers, than that included in the bill for the Mississippi River. Is the gentleman aware of that fact?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I am obliged to my friend from Louisiana, but he has much too high an opinion of the estimates of the engineers for me. His opinion is very much higher than mine.

Mr. BLANCHARD. That is the estimate of the commission.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. The engineers make their estimates for a specific point at which they have made their examination and surveys. I do not undertake to criticize their work in that respect, or criticize them in any manner in the sense that there is not a proper discharge of their duties. But I stand here representing a State with a large interest in cheap transportation upon an entirely different standpoint from that occupied by the engineers, and from this point I insist again that the appropriation for the Mississippi River is altogether too large if the appropriation for the Missouri River is a proper one.

I yield the remainder of my time—

Mr. VAN EATON. Will the gentleman from Kansas permit a question?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Oh, yes.

Mr. VAN EATON. If I understand the gentleman from Kansas, his point is that the Mississippi River appropriation is entirely too large.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Yes, sir.

Mr. VAN EATON. Do I understand the gentleman from Kansas to contend that upon the principles of hydraulics you can not fill a rat-hole with water? [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have some objections to some of the features of this bill. I have no objection to a limited expenditure for the improvement of rivers and harbors—improvements that can and ought to be made; but I have very great objection to some of the wasteful features of this bill. I believe that some of its appropriations are without any justification or without any warrant whatever; that they are simply a prodigal, wasteful throwing away of the people's money. I find in this bill appropriations for works, without any change in the character of the work, without any proposition whatever to modify the plans of the engineers who are conducting the work, and without even a recommendation of a change, although a year ago gentlemen, then and now interested, were denouncing upon this floor these plans as leading to unwarranted extravagance.

Let me call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the appropriation that is asked for the improvement of Galveston Harbor. Last year, in the discussion of the bill, gentlemen representing that city and other gentlemen representing the State of Texas declared here that there was no possibility of accomplishing good by the continuation of the plans then adopted by the board of engineers. They were loud and lusty in their denunciation of the work.

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. Do you not know that this appropriation is made under new recommendations and new plans of the engineers, and that a survey has been completed of Galveston Harbor, under which survey and the recommendation thereon by the Chief of Engineers this appropriation is made?

Mr. HEPBURN. Will you tell me the difference between the plan now and what was contemplated at that time?

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. There is a considerable difference. One difference is that at that time they were using brush for revetments. Now they propose to use stone. That is one of the changes, and of course it necessarily involves a greater expenditure, but the work is more permanent. I want to say further that another change is in the lines of the jetties; that they are placed nearer together under this plan than they were before.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will you tell me how much nearer?

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. Several hundred feet. I have sent for the report. I think it is six or eight hundred feet.

Mr. HEPBURN. Last year the objection was not that brush was being used; but it was claimed then that these jetties were 3,000 feet apart; that they were so wide that there was no possibility of securing the scouring process and no possibility of the deepening of the channel. And gentlemen told us there was loss of water on the bar after the expenditure of millions of dollars—less of water on the bar than when the improvement was begun. And they read to us here from reports to show conclusively—and they were able to do it—that those statements were correct.

Not only that, but the gentleman representing the city of Galveston himself moved to strike out of the bill an appropriation of \$250,000 for that work, saying, as he did so, that it was a waste of public money. Then gentlemen wanted seven and a half millions of dollars for this improvement. Are we to understand, and will the chairman of the committee state whether new plans have been adopted at Galveston in accordance with the scheme that was then upon the tapis, and that is to cost seven and a half millions of dollars by estimate and twenty-five millions in fact?

Mr. WILLIS. There is no such plan pending in Congress. There is a new plan, which lessens the width.

Mr. HEPBURN. Is it substantially the plan of Mr. Eads?

Mr. WILLIS. Not at all; and the gentleman will understand me when I say it is just the reverse. It is a plan of the United States engineers.

Mr. HEPBURN. Substantially the plan originally adopted, only slightly narrowing the channel—

Mr. WILLIS. There is that much of difference; the only objection to the original plan was the width.

Mr. HEPBURN. And changing from brush to stone.

Mr. Chairman, I find another appropriation here, an appropriation of more than \$2,000,000, for the improvement of the Mississippi River. And yet the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE]—and there is no one in this House, in my judgment, who is better informed on the subject of the Mississippi River improvement or knows more about it theoretically or practically—that gentleman last year told us that the plan upon which the commission was then at work was an absolute and total failure. The gentleman from Arkansas then told us that there was an absolute necessity for an immediate and entire change of the whole programme if benefit was to result from the expenditure of these large sums. Is there any change of the plans of the commission? Have they in any manner modified their views with regard to this great work? Are they not conducting the work now precisely as they proposed to do in their first plan submitted to Congress, namely, the building of levees, the revetment of the banks, and the narrowing of the channels for the purpose of scouring out the bottom of the river—the same plans that they were working upon last year, that the gentleman from Arkansas told us were to result in absolute failure and to make this appropriation a wasteful and prodigal expenditure of the public money?

I have no hostility, Mr. Chairman, to the improvement of the Mississippi River. I believe that its navigation ought to be improved. I have no faith in the pretense that it is an improvement of the navigation of that great river that these expenditures are for. Strike out of this appropriation and of the plan of the commission the levee feature, and in my humble judgment there is no gentleman from the Lower Mississippi River that will raise his hand to secure an appropriation.

Will you remember, sir, with what tenacity these gentlemen have clung upon all occasions to retaining the power upon the part of the commission to build the levees? And it seems to me that sometimes they have acted with something else than fairness and ingenuousness in their efforts to secure a continuation of that power. Let me call your attention to a clause of this bill. On page 47, I read this proviso:

That no portion of this appropriation shall be expended to repair or build levees for the purpose of reclaiming lands or preventing injury to lands by overflow.

That would seem to be a very proper provision. What right has the planter of Louisiana or the planter of Mississippi to demand that his private estate shall be protected; that it shall be enhanced in value at the cost of the Government? What right have you of Louisiana to tax the people of Iowa in order to raise your lands above the point of overflow? No one that I know of would have any objection to these lands being the most fertile of the earth; but we do not want their fertility purchased out of our pockets. There is difficulty in that region, and I recognize it.

In the old days and under the old system of labor each plantation was provided with watchful guardians of the levees. There was always a force there instantly to repair the first break in the levee. But it is not so now. I am told that the laborers there are unwilling to devote their energies and their time to the rebuilding of the levees or watching them. There must be some other power, some other authority for this purpose, and in my humble judgment the gentlemen who are the proponents of this measure have discovered in the Mississippi River Commission the watchful guardians that are constantly to look after and care for and rebuild when necessary the levees of that country that make it of value. I want to call your attention a little further to a second proviso which I find on the same page:

Provided, however, That the commission is authorized to pay and build levees, if in their judgment it should be done as a part of their plan to afford ease and safety to the navigation and commerce of the river, and to deepen the channel.

Why, gentlemen, every member of that committee knew that the Mississippi River Commission had declared that the building of levees was absolutely essential to their plan of improving the river, and when they put in the first provision prohibiting the commission from building levees and couple it with this other, it is the merest pretense of fairness. It is an attempt, it seems to me, to throw men off their guard to pretend to say that the public money shall not be expended in the building of levees for private uses, and yet to say that it shall be, because the commission have said that they deem it necessary to build them in order to improve the navigation.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HEPBURN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the language which he has just read has been used in every appropriation made by Congress for the Mississippi River from the time of the formation of the commission in 1879 down to the present time.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know that it has been in every one.



Mr. BLANCHARD. It has.

Mr. HEPBURN. I know that there has been a vigorous effort made to strike it out of some of them, and I know that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD], while protesting all the time that the purpose was not to build levees, has been one of those who have insisted most strenuously upon keeping this ambiguous and disingenuous language in the law.

Mr. BLANCHARD. And the gentleman will do me the justice to state that I have never contended for the construction of levees at all except as a part of the plan of the commission for the improvement of the river.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is just what I am complaining of, Mr. Chairman. I remember that last year the gentleman wanted \$200,000 to be carved out of the appropriations for the purpose of improving and perfecting the harbor of the city of New Orleans; in other words, to riprap one of the levees of the Mississippi River.

Mr. BLANCHARD. When the gentleman makes a statement of that sort he will surely allow me to correct him.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Well, the gentleman from Louisiana did not do anything of the sort.

Mr. HEPBURN. I will appeal to the record. I will not dispute with the gentleman.

Mr. BLANCHARD. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors made an appropriation for the improvement of the harbor of New Orleans under plans submitted by the commission separate and apart from the appropriation for the improvement of the Mississippi River.

Mr. HEPBURN. What was the improvement?

Mr. BLANCHARD. It is stated there in the report.

Mr. HEPBURN. It was the riprapping of the levees of the river.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Not at all. It had nothing to do with the levees of the river.

Mr. HEPBURN. What harbor is there there, except the levees?

Mr. BLANCHARD. It was the improvement of the harbor where the ships anchor; the levees are on the bank.

Mr. HEPBURN. They come right to the bank, do they not?

Mr. BLANCHARD. It was the anchorage-ground of the city of New Orleans.

Mr. HEPBURN. Very well. I think we are both talking about the same thing. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that there are improvements that are needed upon the Mississippi River, for in certain stages of low water there are several bars, perhaps twenty in all, from Saint Louis down, that inconvenience and sometimes interrupt the navigation of the river, and I would be perfectly willing that expenditure should be made for the purpose of rectifying those difficulties. They are local in their nature; they could be easily removed, it seems to me, and I would have no objection to the expenditure of a reasonable sum of money for that purpose; but I have been told, and I believe there is an abundance of authority for the assertion, that the contemplated improvement by the commission will cost hundreds of millions of dollars.

If any gentleman is doubtful with regard to that proposition, I refer him to the testimony that was taken by a special committee of this House about two years since; I refer him to the reports of some of the members of the commission—the disagreeing reports; I refer him to the entire absence, on the part of any one who is authorized to speak or who is supposed to understand the subject, of a contradiction of the statements that have been made from time to time of the immense cost of this improvement.

Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied that this improvement will be of the transcendent benefit that some people seem to think it will. I remember being at one of the great river conventions in the city of Saint Louis, of which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WILLIS] spoke a while ago. He was a guest of the city of Saint Louis at that time, and he will remember that the members of the convention were invited to take a trip on one of those splendid barge vessels and tows with which they navigate that river.

We went some twenty miles down the river. There were pointed out to us nearly a hundred of these large barges and twenty or thirty powerful steamers that propelled them tied to the bank of the river. Yet the river was then at flood. On that very morning there was published in the papers of Saint Louis a notice to all the agents of the railroads not to ship any grain to that city, that all the elevators were full, and that two thousand cars were standing upon the track waiting to be unloaded. Here were millions of bushels of freight seeking a market; here was the river with twenty or more feet of water on every bar from Saint Louis to New Orleans; here were a hundred of these barges and twenty or more steamers tied in idleness to the bank. There was no freight for New Orleans. It was not the direction this grain was seeking. There was no demand for the river, improved or unimproved. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WILLIS] will remember the incident. What was the reason of that? Simply because at the city of New Orleans there are no vessels beyond those needed for the transportation of cotton that can be cheaply laden to Liverpool with grain.

Mr. BLANCHARD. If the gentleman will allow me a moment I will refute his statement that that is not the direction the grain takes.

I desire to read some official statistics showing the grain shipments from New Orleans.

Mr. HEPBURN. You can do that after I am through.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. Not for that purpose. I know what I am talking about, because I witnessed the incident I have stated. The gentleman from Kentucky was there with me at the time, and he knows the truthfulness of my statement. I am perfectly willing to yield for a contradiction from the gentleman from Kentucky if he is disposed to make it.

Mr. WILLIS. I have no recollection of the circumstance; but I implicitly believe the statement which the gentleman makes.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman from Iowa allow me to make one statement?

Mr. HEPBURN. I can not yield for a statement; I will yield for a question.

Mr. KING. Then I will ask a question. Does the gentleman mean to state that there were no ships at New Orleans to carry the grain?

Mr. HEPBURN. I say there is no such excess of transportation at the city of New Orleans as to produce the low rates which we obtain from New York to Liverpool.

Mr. KING. I simply wish to say that ships can and will come to New Orleans for just as much grain as will be delivered for shipment.

Mr. HEPBURN. Undoubtedly; but they will charge full rates; while at New York vessels are competing for this freight; they frequently take grain as ballast; and there have been shipments of it from Chicago to Liverpool at 10 cents a bushel.

These are some of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, why I do not want to vote for these extravagant appropriations. There is no proportion between the results accomplished and the expenses.

I remember, Mr. Chairman, I was able at one time to call the attention of the House to the Blue Book, in which I found the names of such a number of employes of the Mississippi River Commission above the grade of laborers as necessitated an expenditure of \$500,000 a year in the way of salaries. I did not include one laborer in the estimate. Mr. Chairman, the Mississippi River Commission to-day owns twice as many vessels, large and small, as belong to the Federal Navy. They are not so expensive, I admit, and they are not all so large; but they are more than twice as numerous. There are more than 200 vessels, large and small, belonging to the Mississippi River Commission. The plant of that commission is wonderful. It shows that these gentlemen have a proper conception of the magnitude of the work upon which they are employed. They expect it to last many years, and expect it to involve an expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars.

There is another objection I have to this improvement; and that is the imperative necessity of renewing it every five or six or eight years. Where timber is used in narrowing the channel they use the soft woods that grow along the margin of the river. The life of that kind of timber, exposed as it is to the alternations of wet and dry, is from four to five years; so that every four or five years this work will have to be renewed.

I presume every gentleman here is familiar with the method that the commission have adopted. They propose to narrow the channel to a uniform width of 3,000 feet, making it necessary for them to establish a bank nearly the whole length of that stream. They do this by driving two rows of piles a few feet apart, binding them together by wire ropes; then they interweave those with brush for the purpose of retarding the current, expecting that the sediment will be deposited, and in that way they will build up an artificial bank.

They then protect this by immense mattresses of willows and No. 8 wire, lying the mattresses from the bottom up along the sides to the top of this improvement, protecting the natural bank in the same way, and covering that with stone above the low-water mark. Then back of that, at a distance of a quarter or half a mile, they build their levees for the purpose of controlling the river at its flood. Any one can see that this necessitates the building of several thousand miles of levees, because every tributary must have a levee until a point is reached up the river where the bank is of the same height as the levee on the bank of the Mississippi. Thus the work has to be continued, involving the expenditure of hundreds of millions. There is the Saint Francis River, running parallel, which must also be so treated; there is the Atchafalaya, which must be so treated, with all the innumerable bayous and lagoons which are tributary to these streams.

This is the kind of expenditure, gentlemen of the committee, that you are invited to make; and every dollar that is invested, every appropriation that you make gives these gentlemen so much stronger hold upon you. Is it not time to stop this wasteful, prodigal expenditure of the people's money?

Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter I notice in this bill (I did not examine it until to-day) to which I wish to call attention, because there is something of novelty about it. I find it on page 20:

Improving Monongahela River, Pennsylvania and West Virginia: Continuing improvement, \$121,200; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate for the purchase of the works of the Monongahela Navigation Company, situated in the Monongahela River, in the States of Pennsylvania and West Virginia; and in order to ascertain the value of said works the Secretary of War shall appoint a commission of three competent engineers

from the Engineer Corps of the United States Army, who shall value and appraise the same and report to the Secretary of War. And if the said Monongahela Navigation Company shall offer and bind itself to take for said works a price deemed by the Secretary of War to be satisfactory and not excessive, he shall so report to the Congress at its next succeeding session; but if the said Monongahela Navigation Company refuses to sell its works, or demands a price therefor deemed to be excessive, then the Secretary of War shall be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire said works by condemnation for the United States; or, in the exercise of his discretion, the Secretary of War may, and he is hereby authorized to, take possession of said works in the name of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, is not that somewhat of a harsh method of proceeding? Is there not something of hardship in that, gentlemen of the committee? Here is a navigation company authorized to exist, authorized to possess certain property, possessing that property under sanction of law, which they do not want to sell perhaps, and here we give authority to take possession of that property, and if they can not agree on a price, or if the owner will not sell it for such sum as the Secretary of War thinks it ought to bring, then he is authorized to take it without price.

Is that Jeffersonian Democracy? Did Mr. Jefferson discover such ample authority on the part of the Federal Government in the Constitution? Gentlemen, it will not do for you to talk here about being Jeffersonian Democrats. You will have to limit your classification to Jackson men. Old Hickory might do that—Jefferson never.

There is one thing in this bill which perhaps in one sense I commend, and that is \$15,000,000 and probably \$18,000,000 will be in it before it passes through the two Houses. I am glad of that amount in one sense, because I remember something of history. Four years ago the Republican party in this House had a majority, I think, of 11 votes. That majority was seduced into passing a river and harbor bill appropriating \$18,000,000, and it carried 81 majority of Democrats into the next House. I am hoping history will repeat itself, and if you gentlemen desire to pass a river and harbor bill of \$18,000,000, grief will come to you as it came to us; and that would be the only solace I would have for the enormities I find in the bill. [Laughter.]

There is one other thing connected with this bill I can commend, and that is the very liberal manner in which the committee treated its membership. [Laughter.]

Here is a gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEWART], an amiable gentleman, who ought to have very largely whatever he asks for; and, by the way, he has asked largely, and secured nearly a round million for Texas. Here is the gentleman from New York [Mr. BURLEIGH], active, energetic, always around when anything for New York is to be secured, and he has been able to secure nearly \$900,000 for the Empire State. Here is my friend from California [Mr. MARKHAM], who is modest and quiet and new to his duties here. Just look at the bill and see how amply he has provided for the State of California. What will he not do when he has served a score of years!

Mr. MARKHAM. He knows its necessities.

Mr. HEPBURN. Look at Michigan! She has been well represented in the committee; magnificently in the bill. [Laughter.] I doubt whether there is an inlet to the land from the surrounding lakes which has not a place in this bill. They are all named without regard to the unpronounceable character of their names. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time yielded to the gentleman, forty minutes, has expired. There remain thirty minutes to the opponents of the bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. Other gentlemen may need that time. [Cries of "Go on!"]

Mr. JONES, of Alabama. If I have the floor I will yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was informed the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] might wish to be heard. If he does not, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Iowa to control the time left to the opponents of the bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. I will extend my remarks in print and leave that time for other gentlemen.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Chairman, thanking my friend from Alabama for the few minutes yielded to me, I will endeavor to correct some of the statements made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], the opportunity to correct which he denied me in the course of his speech.

When the gentleman from Iowa said he had gone down the river 20 miles from Saint Louis in 1880, and saw a number of barges belonging to the Mississippi River commerce lying there idle, and then went on to state that it indicated there was no grain from Saint Louis being shipped southward, I rose not for the purpose of contradicting his statement about seeing barges lying idle along the banks of the river, but to correct his assertion that the southward direction was not the one which any considerable amount of grain was taking. He denied me the opportunity to have read some figures which I now call his attention to.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a statement of the quantity of wheat shipped by the river route from Saint Louis to New Orleans prior to the construction of the jetties at the mouth of the river and a statement of the shipments made since the completion of the jetties there. I hope my friend from Iowa will give heed to these.

There were shipped before the construction of the jetties—this is the

exports of grain from New Orleans—4,400,000 bushels of wheat. The depth of the channel on the bar at the mouth of the Mississippi River at that time was from 12 to 18 feet. There have been shipped since the construction of the jetties 48,700,000 bushels of wheat, and the depth of the channel at the mouth of the river has been increased to 26 and 30 feet.

Mr. HEPBURN. How many years since the jetties were completed? Mr. BLANCHARD. It gives the amount in round numbers before and after the construction of the jetties.

Mr. HEPBURN. But how many years since the completion of the jetties?

Mr. BLANCHARD. My recollection is the jetties were completed in 1879.

Before the jetties were constructed the foreign steamship arrivals—in 1873—numbered 83, with an aggregate tonnage of 107,000 tons. After the construction of the jetties, in 1883, the number of foreign steamships aggregated 402; increasing from 83 per annum before the construction up to 402 per annum after the construction, while the aggregate tonnage was increased from 107,000 to 653,000 tons.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BLANCHARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEPBURN. How much of the aggregate of 48,000,000 bushels wheat was received by rail from California for shipment by way of New Orleans?

Mr. BLANCHARD. How much was shipped by rail from California?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANCHARD. The statement does not show that, but I know it was comparatively very little.

Now, Mr. Chairman, pursuing the inquiry further: Before the jetties were built a vessel of 1,500 or 2,000 tons' capacity was above the average in arrivals at New Orleans. Now, since the success of the jetties, vessels of 5,000 tons' capacity are loaded at New Orleans. Before the jetties vessels were loaded to not over 15 feet draught; now vessels are laden to 26 and 27½ feet draught, and pass out to sea without difficulty. Before the jetties were completed skillful pilotage and management were of no avail, for the channels were ever shifting; now, where a vessel is kept within the jetty channel, detentions are unknown.

Before the jetties the tonnage on vessels was from \$1.25 to \$1.50 per ton. Now it can and has been had for 50 cents a ton, and a proportionate reduction in the rates of insurance on vessels and cargoes has also been made.

Before the jetties the exports of grain were 5,750,000 a year; now they are 14,250,000. The total exports were valued at \$68,000,000; now they amount to \$94,000,000; an increase of 50 per cent.

Before the jetties foreign freights were 18 to 24 cents per bushel; now they are from 8 to 12 cents. Nor is it true, as some suppose, that grain is liable to become musty and thereby injured by passing through the heated regions in transit through New Orleans to a foreign market. Here is a well-authenticated statement completely refuting that:

In 1879 or 1880 two barges were loaded with corn and wheat at Saint Paul, as an experiment to test this very question. Its transit at points was purposely delayed, and it was held in New Orleans in the month of July, and was several months on the way; yet on arrival at Liverpool it rated the same as to condition, upon inspection, that it did at Saint Paul. Another instance: a cargo of bulk grain and cotton was loaded upon a steamship; the steamer went ashore at or near the mouth, was brought back to the city, and with cargo intact was placed in dock, repaired, and again went to sea, and in about eighty days after shipment from New Orleans arrived at Liverpool in a perfectly sound condition; all of which proved not only that our Southern climate does not affect its condition, but, as claimed by Mr. Eads, a vessel with a full cargo can be taken from the water into a dock without injury.

Now as to freight rates. The difference is largely in favor of the river route. During the season of navigation of the Mississippi River the rate from Saint Louis to Liverpool, by rail to New York and by river to New Orleans, has been as follows for the last three years:

1883. Via railroad to New York, per bushel.....	23 to 29
Via river to New Orleans, per bushel.....	17 to 23
Difference in favor of the river route.....	6
1884. Via rail to New York, per bushel.....	15 to 29
Via river to New Orleans, per bushel.....	11 to 20
Difference in favor of the river route.....	4 to 9
1885. Via rail to New York, per bushel.....	14 to 27
Via river to New Orleans, per bushel.....	13 to 13
Difference in favor of the river route.....	1 to 14

Here is an average difference for the three years of at least 6 cents per bushel in favor of the river route. The country affected by this difference produced in 1885, according to the estimate of the Agricultural Department, 357,112,000 bushels of wheat, which, at 6 cents per bushel, would be worth \$21,466,720 more than it is. With this great difference and advantage in favor of the river route, a very considerable portion of the grain crops of the country will, undoubtedly, go southward, the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DUNHAM] to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is useless, Mr. Chairman, to pursue the subject further. There is no indisposition on the part of the grain from the West to find an



outlet to sea through the Mississippi River at New Orleans, and the figures show it and refute the mere assertions of gentlemen to the contrary.

Again, the gentleman from Iowa made an extravagant statement concerning the number of vessels used by the Mississippi River Commission in the work of improving that stream. Now, as showing the true facts relative to this, I read from the report of the commission itself:

Mr. HEPBURN. What report?

Mr. BLANCHARD. The report for 1885.

Mr. HEPBURN. Take the report for 1884 and see what it says.

Mr. BLANCHARD. This statement embraces the entire plant belonging to the Government for the improvement of more than 1,500 miles of navigable water way on the great Father of Waters.

The present plant now in use by the Mississippi Commission comprises 14 steam towboats, 7 steam-launches, tugs, and survey boats, 49 quarter-boats, 83 pile-drivers, 6 hydraulic graders, 1 dredge, 6 dump boats, 2 pump boats, 3 derrick boats, 6 shop boats, 5 dock boats and store boats, 19 mattress boats, 2 ways, 8 screen boats, 263 barges, 25 coal boats, shells, and flats, and a number of skiffs, yawls, and sounding boats, tools, instruments, gauging apparatus, &c., aggregating in value \$1,267,000.

However large that showing may make the number of boats belonging to the Government and the value of the plant in use, it is for the improvement of over 1,500 miles of navigable water way from the Des Moines Rapids to the Gulf of Mexico, and is not greater than the actual needs of the service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] allow me to make one statement in reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. JONES, of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman if it does not come out of my time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. In regard to the rate of freight from New Orleans the gentleman from Iowa said there had been no reduction.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh no; I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I understood the gentleman to say that. I will make this statement: I remember seeing two or three years ago a statement from the Cotton Exchange of New Orleans that the saving upon cotton freight to Liverpool and the East was a saving of a dollar a bale; and that the saving on freight rates to the commerce of the Mississippi Valley by the jetties had paid for the jetties every two years since they had been in existence.

Mr. HEPBURN. I have raised no question about that.

Mr. JONES, of Alabama. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this general debate, as far as it has progressed, and the opposition, so far as made to the bill reported by the committee, have amply vindicated the wisdom of the proposition made by the chairman of the committee, that the general debate should be dispensed with. It seems to me that the opposition is perfectly trivial, and that it has amounted to nothing in the hour, or more than an hour, that has been occupied by the adversaries of the bill.

Why, sir, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON] has made an objection to the bill on the ground of the perfection of the Mississippi River. He says that it has come from the hands of the Creator so perfect, so fit for navigation, that it was entirely useless to appropriate money for its improvement. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Mississippi River has come from the hands of its Creator in a very imperfect state. Like all natural blessings it has been bestowed upon us to be improved, to be perfected by human skill. The Mississippi River is no exception to that rule. On the contrary, it needs more improvement, it needs more work than any other river in this country on account of its peculiar nature and eccentric habits.

The gentleman assumes that the work that has been done and the work that is contemplated by the commission on that river consists of levees. That is very far from being the fact. The Congress of the United States saw fit several years ago to create a Mississippi River Commission, and to put this great river of 2,000 miles of navigable water under that commission. It was an experiment, and was conceded at the time to be an experiment. But they have gone further, and the results obtained justify the wisdom of that measure. They have attained a depth now at Providence reach and Plumb Point reach of about 13 feet to show for their work.

Mr. HEPBURN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. JONES, of Alabama. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEPBURN. What has it cost—how many millions—to get 13 feet of water at these two points?

Mr. JONES, of Alabama. The gentleman may have his opinion of the cost—

Mr. HEPBURN. It has cost a million of dollars a foot.

Mr. JONES, of Alabama. No matter if it has cost more than that, the results would justify it.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON] said they were taxing the people of his State to improve the Lower Mississippi and that the people of Kansas had no interest in that improvement. It is, Mr. Chairman, to the interest of the people of Kansas, a large wheat-growing State,

that their grain should find its way to the seaboard at a low cost of transportation. That is a great wheat-growing country and greatly stands in need of cheap transportation.

Mr. DUNHAM. The grain does not want to go that way.

Mr. JONES, of Alabama. When the facilities are furnished it will go that way, and it has gone that way to the extent of millions and millions of bushels, as has been shown by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD]. It will always follow the cheapest route.

Objection further was made that certain harbors are to be improved on that river and not on others. The answer is, this is part of the work of the commission. The gentleman from Kansas assumes the work by the commission consists in building the levees. This is not true. Their work consists of a contraction of the stream and making revetments where it is necessary to prevent cut-offs that might change the channel of the river. The commission does not hesitate to avail itself of levees already constructed, and to supplement them when it is necessary for channel improvement or for the benefit of navigation. It is no part of their business to reclaim lands. Why should the commission seek to reclaim lands when it is not to their interest and outside of their functions?

The gentleman from Iowa has made the same kind of attack upon the bill. These attacks are merely beating over again the old straw that has come down to us from the last session of Congress. It is that and nothing more. The gentleman from Iowa makes a concluding objection, that the bill amounts to \$15,000,000, and perhaps more; and he has conjured up the apparition of the bill of 1882, which appropriated \$18,000,000, and exhibited it here to "affright the souls of fearful adversaries." That bill has no terror for us. This bill is not like the bill of 1882, not even in amount. This is a bill which provides for two fiscal years, and dividing the aggregate amount between these two fiscal years it is only \$7,500,000 for each. As long as eight years ago, in 1878, the appropriation by Congress for one fiscal year was over \$8,000,000.

Since then the estimated wealth of this country has increased enormously, our population has increased wonderfully, and do we not need any larger appropriations to furnish transportation for this increased population and this increased wealth? And yet in point of fact we are now appropriating a smaller amount annually than in 1878. Why, sir, as for that bill of 1882, the House of Representatives in the December following its passage adopted a resolution calling upon the Secretary of War to furnish information about some portions of the bill, and, among other things, to inform the House "whether any money appropriated by that act was appropriated for works or objects that are not in the interest of, or for the benefit of, commerce or navigation." The Secretary of War, in response to the resolution, culled out from that eighteen million bill a number of objects and items which in his opinion were not for the interests of commerce or for the good of navigation.

I have taken the trouble to add them up, and they amount to less than 5 per cent. of the eighteen millions appropriated, and I undertake to say that if the unworthy objects in the bill that is now pending before this committee could be culled out they would not amount to 2 per cent. of the total appropriation made by the bill. That leaves 98 per cent. of this bill that is wholly beneficial to our commerce, foreign and internal. And, Mr. Chairman, what is that commerce? The report of the Bureau of Statistics, which I hold in my hand, shows that in the year 1884 the foreign commerce of the United States was valued at one billion four hundred and eight millions; and the same report goes on to declare that our internal commerce is beyond computation, that it can not be estimated, but that it is at least fifty times as great as our foreign commerce; so that it must be a good deal more than \$50,000,000,000.

Now, sir, what is the use of these carping criticisms and these puerile attacks upon a bill of this character, whose object it is to furnish transportation for this enormous commerce? The country demands cheap transportation, and if this \$15,000,000 here appropriated will reduce the cost of transportation one quarter of 1 per cent., it will give back to the people more than the amount appropriated in the saving to the producers and consumers of our widely extended country. Sir, the population of this country and the productions of this country have increased more rapidly than the means of transportation. Private capital and private enterprise have done much to furnish the required transportation.

Private enterprise, as the chairman [Mr. WILLIS] has stated, has built 128,000 miles of railroads in this country, and they represent an investment of \$8,000,000,000. Those railroads carry, as he has stated, 400,000,000 tons of freight annually. And, sir, private enterprise would have improved our natural water ways if it had been permitted to do so, but whenever private enterprise undertook to do that, it was met by the stern injunction of the General Government, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther." This Government has assumed exclusive jurisdiction over the harbors and the navigable waters of this country, and when it assumed that jurisdiction it assumed also the obligation to improve them.

Mr. Chairman, this country is peculiarly adapted to cheap and ample water communications. There is no other country on the face of the earth so highly favored in that respect, and it becomes us, representing such vast interests here, the interests of agriculture, the interests of



mining, the interests of the commerce to which I have referred, to assist nature, and to furnish the cheap transportation that the people demand. That is a duty that is devolved upon us, and we ought to meet it. Our agricultural interests are more important than any other. More people are engaged in agriculture. More capital is invested in agriculture than in any other occupation. Agriculture receives less protection and bears more burdens than any other interest, and one of the heaviest burdens now resting upon our farmers is the heavy cost of transporting their crops to market. Hence we find the farmers so unanimous and so earnest in asking for these appropriations and these improvements. Our wheat and our cotton are now engaged in a death-struggle with the cheap wheat and cotton of India. England and other countries have been building water communications to cheapen transportation. The consequence is a great increase in the production of cheap grain and cheap cotton to compete with American wheat and American cotton. Since the opening of the Suez Canal American cereal exports have diminished in proportion to the increase of Indian exports. We are therefore compelled in self-defense and on behalf of our farmers to follow the example of these countries and furnish cheaper transportation. Our exports will increase, prices will increase, prosperity will increase as carrying rates are cut down.

As I have said, the railroads do much to furnish transportation, but it is well known that they do it primarily for their own benefit, and that they charge high rates upon the freight that goes over them. The problem that is agitating State Legislatures, the problem that this Congress has been grappling with for eight or ten years, is how to regulate the railroads; but, sir, in my judgment, the best solution of that problem is to be found in cheap water transportation, in the competition of the water ways. Nothing excels water for cheap transportation. When our northern lakes and rivers are blockaded with ice and navigation is obstructed, up go the railroad rates; but when spring returns and the ice disappears, down go the railroad rates. The railroad lines between Cincinnati and New Orleans raise their rates from 50 cents per hundred pounds in high water to 80 cents per hundred pounds in low water. These facts show the influence of water transportation in controlling the railroads, and that is the most effectual way of regulating the charges of these railroads, which carry 400,000,000 tons of freight a year in this country.

But these appropriations, in regard to which gentlemen make complaint as to their amount, are not like other appropriations; they are for works which are permanent in their nature. The benefits are continuing. The appropriations for the support of the Army and Navy, for the Indians, for pensions, are consumed in their use; their expenditure leaves no trace behind; but the results of these appropriations for rivers and harbors remain with us; and, as I have shown, they are beneficent. Why, sir, according to the report of the Labor Bureau, one million laborers were recently out of employment, and in the debate on the labor-arbitration bill a few days ago it was stated that this number had increased to one million and a half.

Now, while I do not believe that it is one of the functions of this Government to furnish employment to its citizens, yet, when in times of depression and distress, and we can produce this beneficent result in the performance of a legitimate public duty, when expediency goes hand in hand with the Constitution, as it does in this case, it is our duty to make liberal appropriations for these public works, and thus benefit the labor of the country. In no bill that Congress passes do the expenditures go so directly to the people or benefit so directly the labor of the country as these appropriations for rivers and harbors. They furnish work to the laboring man and they give him wages for his work.

Mr. Chairman, if I have any time remaining I yield it to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEWART].

The CHAIRMAN. There are five minutes of the gentleman's time remaining.

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the appropriation made for harbor improvement at Galveston, the largest commercial city upon the coast of the State which I have the honor in part to represent upon this floor, has been attacked by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], I feel it my duty to say a few words in reply. It is true that quite a number of the citizens of Galveston have not been satisfied with the progress of harbor improvement at that city under the supervision of the Government engineers, and they believed that better and more speedy results in the harbor improvement of that city could be obtained by this Government entering into a contract with the great engineer Capt. James B. Eads than would be accomplished by the Army engineers.

About this there was a division of sentiment among the people of Galveston. But a committee came from Galveston to this city during the first session of the Forty-eighth Congress and prevailed upon the Senators and Representatives from Texas to urge upon Congress the adoption of what was known as the "Eads plan" for harbor improvement at Galveston, and in doing this the Texas delegation who favored it believed that they were serving the best interests of Galveston and of the country.

A bill was introduced in this House which, in effect, was a contract with Captain Eads on the part of this Government for the improvement

of Galveston Harbor, and it was commonly called the "Eads bill;" and one precisely like it was introduced in the Senate, and I am not sure, but think it was passed by that body. It may not be improper for me to say that although I never actively opposed the Eads bill, I was never friendly to it, and that I was very much opposed to its becoming a part of the river and harbor bill, and I was glad when it was not incorporated in said bill.

In this House the Eads bill was never acted upon, and I do not think it was reported to the House from the committee to which it had been referred. But it was during the pendency of the "Eads bill" that the gentleman from Iowa heard the declarations made that there was no possibility of accomplishing good at Galveston by the continuation of the plans then adopted by the board of engineers. I also remember what has been stated by the gentleman, that Mr. Ochiltree, who then was the immediate representative of the city of Galveston, moved to strike from the river and harbor bill the appropriation of \$250,000 that had been made for the improvement of Galveston Harbor, and that he succeeded in having it done. I shall never forget it.

But, Mr. Chairman, the striking out of the appropriation made for Galveston in the bill of 1884 and the denunciations of the Government plans and of the Government engineers were but the indiscretions of a hot-tempered zeal for the success of the "Eads bill," and I beg you to consider the injustice of denying a sufficient appropriation for harbor improvement at Galveston because of what has been said by comparatively a few men, of whom it is not disrespectful to say that they knew no more about the matter than many others who differed with them in regard to it.

I never shared in the opinions that were then expressed about the work at Galveston. I then regretted, and I now regret, that in the zeal manifested for the Eads bill such opinions were expressed. Doubtless the gentlemen who expressed those opinions believe they were correct, but they were not, in my judgment, based upon established facts. What was the criticism made by Captain Eads upon the work at Galveston? In brief, he said the jetty walls were too far apart and not high enough, and for these reasons they could never accomplish the result predicted by the Government engineers. I thought if these objections were well founded that the correction could be easily applied by the Government engineers and at less cost to the Government.

General Newton, the Chief of Engineers, has submitted during this session a supplemental report upon the improvement of the harbor at Galveston, in which it is shown that the changes proposed to be made at that point will remove all just cause for criticism, and I see no reason why the work of harbor improvement at that point should not be prosecuted, and why the Government engineers may not be relied upon to obtain all the success that could be secured by Captain Eads, or by any one else, and if you will but make as large appropriations for Galveston as were required by the provisions of the Eads bill they will secure such success quite as rapidly.

I beg to call the attention of the House to the fact that no appropriation has been made for the improvement of Galveston Harbor since the passage of the bill for river and harbor appropriations in 1882, and that no work has been done at Galveston since that appropriation was exhausted. The appropriation made for Galveston in the bill of 1884, amounting to \$250,000, was, as I have before stated, stricken out, and the river and harbor bill for 1885 failed to pass the Senate, and for these reasons Galveston has been without an appropriation since 1882, and this fact should appeal strongly to the House for a liberal appropriation for Galveston at this time.

Galveston is the largest city upon the coast line of Texas, and has a population of not less than 35,000 and possibly 40,000 inhabitants, and it is now the largest commercial port in my State. I deny that money expended for harbor improvement at Galveston has been wasted.

I assert that the work done by the Government at Galveston has been of great benefit to that port and to the commerce of Texas. It has fixed the channel, and has given an increased depth of water upon the outer bar of not less than 18 inches if not 2 feet, and I make this assertion upon the testimony of experienced seamen and shipmasters who have been thoroughly acquainted with the entrance to Galveston Harbor for more than twenty years, and their testimony is corroborated by the pilot books kept at Galveston.

It is unfortunate that the work of harbor improvement at Galveston was stopped by the refusal to accept of the appropriation made in the river and harbor bill of 1884, but I trust that this appropriation may not be decreased, for it is no more than is necessary, and with it the work may be resumed, and with appropriations that may hereafter be made I trust that the work may be continued until all obstructions to navigation are permanently removed. My friend from Iowa said that I was amiable and ought to have largely what I ask for, and that I had asked largely and had obtained for Texas nearly a round million of dollars.

Will my friend permit me to suggest a better reason for the appropriations made for harbor improvement on that part of our coast which lies within the limits of Texas? In the first place, much is required to be done on that coast, and the estimates furnished by the Secretary of War are large, but not larger than are absolutely required, and no



greater proportion of those estimates have been allowed in the pending bill than have been given to other sections of the country, and in many instances they are not so great.

It must be remembered that Texas is a great State. Within her limits are more than 274,000 square miles, and this great area of territory is divided into more than two hundred counties, and the State is rapidly increasing in population. In 1870 the population of Texas was 819,000; in 1880 it was 1,597,618; in October, 1884, it had increased to 2,215,318, and now it is safe to assert that we have a population of not less than two and one-half millions.

It has been said, and I believe truly, that Texas has a cotton belt as large as the State of Mississippi, a sugar section as large as the State of Louisiana, a wheat region as large as the State of Ohio, a mineral bed as large as the State of Pennsylvania, and grazing grounds larger than the State of Kentucky. Texas produces one-fifth, if not one-fourth, of the cotton crop of the United States. In 1884 her cotton crop was 1,456,000 bales. In all the valuable woods she is without a rival.

In the report of forestry made by Mr. Sargeant to Census Bureau it is shown that in Texas there is growing a pine forest that if now cut into lumber would aggregate 65,000,000,000 feet. Large crops of corn and small grain are made, and much larger crops of grain would be made if cheap transportation could be had to carry the surplus to other markets. We have beef and mutton enough to feed all the people of the United States, and our live-stock of all kinds are estimated to be not less than twelve millions in number, and to-day Texas is the largest wool-growing State in this Union, Ohio to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. REED, of Maine. We will take care of the wool-growing interest for you. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEWART. We will discuss that when we reach the proper bill. Yet with all these vast products, with her increasing wealth and population, Texas, unlike other States of this Union, is almost entirely without navigable rivers to carry her products to the sea or to regulate and cheapen freights by rail. Within the State of Texas there are more than seven thousand miles of railway, and the agricultural interests of Texas are completely at the mercy of railroad combinations.

With a coast line of more than 400 miles in length, there is not a harbor in which a vessel drawing 18 feet of water can enter, and but one in which a vessel of 15 feet draught can safely venture. There is a pressing necessity not only for improvement of the harbor at Galveston but for all the harbors upon the coast of Texas.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield five minutes of my time to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, almost destitute as Texas is of navigable rivers there is but one practicable mode by which transportation may be cheapened in that State and her people liberated from the domination of corporate power, and that is to improve not only Galveston Harbor but all the harbors of the Texas coast. Let there be as many competitive points for freight by water as the coast will supply.

Short hauls by competitive lines of railway to these competitive points on the Gulf coast will do much to solve the problem, and I am sure it will result in benefit to every portion of the State. Nor is Texas alone interested in the development and improvement of the harbors upon her coast. All that vast extent of territory lying north of Texas between the Mississippi River on the east and the Rocky Mountains on the west have a very great interest in the improvement and development of those harbors, for they are their nearest outlet to the sea.

If a wise policy shall be adopted and pursued by this Government, which shall bring us into closer and better commercial relations with Mexico and the countries of Central and South America, the day is not far distant when the ports on the Texas coast will be the gateways through which a commerce will pass that now it is impossible to even approximate its great value, and in national importance those ports will be second to few others to be found in this Union. Deep water in Texas harbors is not only a necessity to the people of Texas, but it is equally so to a very large portion of the people of the United States.

I desire to emphasize what has been so well stated by the chairman of the committee, that in the preparation of this bill no attempt was made to divide the appropriations among the different States, geographical lines were not observed, and we did not consider any place merely with reference to its locality. We only looked to the commercial importance and necessities of each place as shown by the report of the officer of this Government having in charge its improvement, and to such other testimony tending to establish these facts as may have been brought to the attention of the committee.

It trust that the same rule which controlled the committee in the preparation of the bill will govern the House in its consideration, and that no sectional feeling will prevent any one from giving to the bill that fair and impartial consideration which should be accorded to a measure of so much importance to the entire people of this country.

Public sentiment in this country is far in advance of Congress upon the subject of internal improvements. This assertion may be strange, but it is nevertheless true; recent events show that it is true.

Large conventions have been held in different sections of this Union

for the express purpose of considering the improvement of our water ways, and they have implored Congress to make sufficient appropriations. These conventions were held at Saint Paul, Kansas City, New Orleans, Savannah, and Tuscaloosa. They were not merely the representatives of special interests, but they were largely composed of men representing the entire business interests of the country.

At the Saint Paul convention it was declared to be the sense of the convention that an annual expenditure of \$25,000,000 should be made for the improvement of our water routes, and in the other conventions which I have named it was declared that an enlightened policy demanded liberal appropriations from this Government for the improvement of its rivers and harbors.

Cheap transportation is the key to prosperity, and there is no question before the American people at this time of more vital importance to their prosperity than this question of cheap transportation. All admit that water routes furnish the cheapest transportation, but they do more; they regulate and cheapen transportation by railways. All the conventions to which I have alluded bear testimony to this fact, and it was abundantly sustained by the testimony of all who appeared before the committee during its deliberations.

But it must not be concluded that because water transportation is cheaper, and makes transportation by rail cheaper, that the improvement of our rivers and harbors will injure the railways of the country. It will not do it. It must be remembered that articles of light weight will always seek the more rapid transit by rail, while heavy, bulky articles can be transported with more convenience and at less cost by water, but the great and underlying cause of there being no destructive antagonism between water and rail transportation is to be found in the fact that the cheap transportation afforded by navigable waters to the heavy farm products of the country adds largely to the wealth of the producers and their increased ability to supply their wants and gratify their desires creates and expands commerce, manufactures, and all other industries which give employment to all kinds of carriers.

No class receive greater benefits from the increased prosperity of the country than do our common carriers.

From Poor's Manual for Railroads for 1885 I learn that at the close of last year there were in the United States 125,151 miles of railroads and also 156,496 miles of track, estimated to have cost \$6,924,554,444, or but little less than \$45,000 per mile. I suppose this estimate includes rolling-stock and all the equipments necessary for their operation, and as the amount is large it may also include watered stock, fictitious bonds, and other fraudulent devices too frequently connected with railroad management in this country.

Of one thing we may be sure, and it is that large interest upon this amount and perhaps more is annually exacted from the producers of this country by those who have the management and control of said railways. It is a burden upon the agricultural interests of this country, which can be lightened by the improvement of the rivers and harbors, and I believe more substantial good will result to the people from liberal expenditures for this purpose than for any other, save the necessary expense of maintaining the Government.

What interest upon the cost and equipage of these roads is annually expended in their maintenance and repair I do not know; I have frequently heard it asserted that not less than 50 per cent. of their earnings were thus expended. But for my purpose now I will assume that not more than 10 per cent. of their original cost is thus expended in the annual repair and equipment of these roads, and we have a sum of more than \$600,000,000. How infinitesimal does the amount of this bill appear in comparison with the amount that is annually expended by corporations in the improvement of their railways.

Mr. Chairman, it is believed that we now have in this country more than sixty millions of people, and that the aggregate wealth of the country is not less than fifty billions of dollars. These two facts—the population and wealth of the country—should be properly considered in forming our judgment about the pending bill.

The great number of people who inhabit our vast area of territory, with their restless commercial energies, require the greatest and best facilities for the cheapest transportation to be obtained by means of our water ways, and the wealth of the country is abundantly large to enable the Government to have made such improvement of our water routes as will render them adapted to the ever-increasing demands of commerce, and I believe it is the imperative duty of the Government to do it.

Why should the Representatives of the people hesitate to make sufficient appropriations for the improvement of the rivers and harbors of this country, when they know that the improvement of our water routes will cheapen transportation and reduce the amount of money annually taken from the pockets of the people by corporations?

It is not a pleasant suggestion, but it is nevertheless true, that this Government has—in land and money—donated vastly more money for the construction of railways than it has from its foundation until now appropriated for the improvement of rivers and harbors. Navigable waters are free to all, and they are free from the oppression of corporate power, and, if properly protected and improved by the Government, they will be of incalculable value to the people. The people have asked



that sufficient appropriations shall be made, and I hope that this Congress will not fail to comply with their request.

Mr. HISCOCK. I am a seeker after information in reference to this bill, and I ask the attention of the chairman of the committee. I understand this bill appropriates \$2,250,000 for the Lower Mississippi. Whereabouts will I find estimates and plans for the work at New Orleans?

Mr. WILLIS. It is in the fourth volume of the report of the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. HISCOCK. What year?

Mr. WILLIS. This present fiscal year. I hold it here in my hand.

Mr. HISCOCK. I would like to have the date of the estimate. I do not care what volume it is in.

Mr. WILLIS. It is before me and in a moment it will be given to the gentleman.

Mr. HISCOCK. I pass on from that while he is looking for it, and ask if he will tell me where I will find the report for the rectification of the Red and Atchafalaya Rivers?

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman's question was in reference to the port of New Orleans. He will find that on page 2871 of the fourth volume of the report of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army.

Mr. HISCOCK. What is the date of the estimate?

Mr. WILLIS. In December last, 1885.

Mr. HISCOCK. What is the estimate?

Mr. WILLIS. Six hundred and eighty-three thousand six hundred dollars.

Mr. HISCOCK. For the rectification of the Red and Atchafalaya Rivers, where will we find that?

Mr. WILLIS. In one second.

Mr. HISCOCK. Read in that connection also the estimate for the Greenville reach.

Mr. WILLIS. In regard to the Red and Atchafalaya Rivers the gentleman will find it on page 2868.

Mr. HISCOCK. What is the date of the recommendation?

Mr. WILLIS. It is in the last report; December, 1885.

Mr. HISCOCK. There is a recommendation of that date?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes, sir. In regard to the Greenville reach, about which the gentleman also inquires, he will find it on page 2871. The estimate is \$186,000.

Mr. HISCOCK. That leaves a million and a half for the general improvement of the Mississippi River.

Mr. WILLIS. One million seven hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HISCOCK. Where will I find estimates, plans, and recommendations for that amount?

Mr. WILLIS. I have them before me in the report of the committee.

Mr. HISCOCK. Give the date.

Mr. WILLIS. Page 2871. I will read it.

Mr. HISCOCK. Who is that by?

Mr. WILLIS. The Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. HISCOCK. What date?

Mr. WILLIS. Last report, December, 1885.

ESTIMATES OF FUNDS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1887.

For continuing the improvement of the Mississippi River from Des Moines Rapids to the mouth of the Illinois River.....	\$500,000
For continuing the improvement of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Illinois River to Cairo, Ill.....	1,000,000
For continuing the improvement of the Mississippi River from Cairo, Ill., to the Head of the Passes, including the improvement of the Red River at and below the head of the Atchafalaya.....	5,000,000

Mr. HISCOCK. In that report is there any recommendation this money should be appropriated and expended; and, if so, by whom?

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly.

Mr. HISCOCK. By whom?

Mr. WILLIS. The commission.

Mr. HISCOCK. The commission recommended it? Give me the names of the gentlemen who recommended it. And I ask these questions, if the gentleman will pardon me, in the light of the declarations made on the floor in the last Congress, I believe, that the plan of the Mississippi River Commission for the improvement of the Mississippi River had proved a failure, and that it had been demonstrated it was a failure and money was being wasted there. I understood these declarations to have been made with deliberation heretofore.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not wish to take up the time of the gentleman, but he will recollect there is a difference between the contraction system and the system of revetment.

Mr. HISCOCK. Has the Mississippi River Commission changed their plan?

Mr. WILLIS. They have not.

Mr. HISCOCK. From the declarations we had at the last session in reference to them it would appear they had. You leave it, then, to the Mississippi River Commission?

Mr. WILLIS. In their statement, if the gentleman will examine it, there would be no further appropriation in the direction he suggests. The gentleman asks who signed it? The following gentlemen:

Q. A. Gillmore, colonel engineers, brevet major-general, U. S. A., president

Mississippi River Commission; Chas. R. Suter, major of engineers, U. S. A.; Henry Mitchell, Coast and Geodetic Survey; B. M. Harrod, R. S. Taylor, S. W. Ferguson.

Mr. Comstock files a supplemental report, in which he recommends two and a half millions.

Mr. REED, of Maine. What is his recommendation?

Mr. WILLIS. A million dollars for Plum Point reach; as much (that is a million) for the Lake Providence reach; half a million for Memphis and the Atchafalaya. That, he says, is ample for the prosecution of those works for the coming fiscal year, and we recommend a quarter million dollars less than Mr. Comstock, the dissenting engineer, recommends.

Mr. REED, of Maine. But you do not recommend its use in the way in which he says that it ought to be used.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Comstock, as the gentleman understands, files a minority report. The committee has been controlled by the views of the other members of the commission, constituting six out of the seven. In other words, we took the judgment of six in preference to the judgment of one. But the question put to me was in regard to the amount recommended by Mr. Comstock, and I have given it.

Mr. REED, of Maine. He recommends an appropriation of \$2,000,000 for specific purposes, and you recommend that it be scattered all over the river.

Mr. WILLIS. He recommends two and a half millions.

Mr. HISCOCK. I wish to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WILLIS] if the report he has before him is the one transmitted by the Secretary of War to Congress. Is it anything other than the report for 1885?

Mr. WILLIS. It is the last report; not the one that you are looking at.

Mr. HISCOCK. I have here the report of the Secretary of War for 1885, and I find in it the report of the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman has probably been misled by the fact that both the report for 1884 and the report for 1885 are in the same volume.

The last report he will find on page 2859. Then there is the supplemental report filed January 15, 1886, which is Executive Document 38, Forty-ninth Congress, first session.

Mr. HISCOCK. I have the document.

The CHAIRMAN. There are fifteen minutes remaining to the opponents of the bill.

Mr. WILLIS. If no one desires to occupy the time, I will call for the reading of the bill.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that it would be useless to ask to reserve these fifteen minutes until to-morrow, and so I will say crudely to-night what perhaps I might say in better shape to-morrow. Although this debate has come upon me somewhat unexpectedly, yet I have a few general considerations which I should like to submit to the committee. My criticism upon the bill will be confined to the appropriations which are made for the benefit, it is said, of the Mississippi River. There are gentlemen in this House who will recollect the origin of this attempt to do something for the Mississippi River. It had its origin in two things: First, a general public clamor against the use of the public money for small creeks and inlets, and a desire that something should be done for what were called, in large language, "the great highways of commerce."

The second cause found its motive in an honest disposition on the part of this nation, especially in the North, to do something for the rehabilitation of the Southern States, their industry and commerce. Both motives were praiseworthy and deserve our highest respect. But if it shall prove, as it seems to me it has proved, that our efforts have resulted simply in a waste of public money, it is time that we call a halt to the transaction. My attention was first awakened to it by the action of members upon the last river and harbor bill but one. I recall the fact that the committee of the House of Representatives appointed and sent to examine and which actually did examine the Mississippi River problem upon the spot was not favorable to any such action as was taken by the House. On that committee were the present Speaker and other members not less distinguished and competent.

In the year 1884, I think it was, on the last river and harbor appropriation bill but one, the proposition was distinctly presented to this House that in all human probability, or, to put it mildly, that there was every reason to suppose, the attempt which had been made was a failure, and that the man who had proposed the plan, and who was specially relied upon to carry it out, Mr. Eads, seeing that failure, had withdrawn himself from any responsibility and resigned his position upon the commission. Under this state of facts the question was presented to this House as well as it could be in the hurry of the then shortened debate, that there was one plain duty for us to perform, and that was to confine this attempt to its experimental stage, to devote all the money that we were willing to spend to two reaches—the Plum Point reach and the Providence reach.

The idea of those who opposed that proposition, so simple and so just, was to scatter the money all up and down the river and make beginnings all around, which would force us to continue the appropriation before the result of the experiment had shown us whether it was a suc-



cess or a failure; and the unanimous mustering of gentlemen on that side first opened the eyes of the country to the character of this transaction.

To improve a great highway for navigation the United States was willing to spend money. To throw money into the Mississippi River with the sole result of reclaiming land upon the banks was something which the people of the United States did not want to do with their money. Precisely that plan, thus objectionable, is followed out in this report and in this bill. We are asked to spend \$2,000,000 all over the river, when to-day no man knows whether the attempt to control that river will be a success or a failure, a fact which could be easily ascertained by carrying out the work in one reach of the river. Am I not right then in saying the purpose and object of this is to get the United States involved in an expenditure to which no man can see an end?

Look at this proviso of the bill which says there shall be no money expended on levees; provided, however, that the commission may expend it if they want to. I say—and I mean no disrespect, for I came very near being fined for disrespect to the committee the last time I spoke on the subject—I say this is a proviso that something shall not be done provided the very fellows who intend to do it shall not think it ought to be done; and we already know they think it ought.

Now, what is the object of all this? Commerce is beyond the control of the Government of the United States. Commerce takes its own way. It is our business to notice the movements of trade. We can help them; we can not change them; that is beyond our utmost power. What is the tendency of modern mercantile transportation? It is upon the lines of shortest time. No merchant to-day sends his ship off on a voyage of months and months, taking his chances that it may arrive when the markets are free from the goods which the ship may bring. To-day he never amasses for himself those sudden and large profits which were the happy fortune of the merchants of olden days. No, sir; the great merchant to-day makes his money by small percentages upon great transactions, and, therefore, he wishes to eliminate from his business every element of loss. He demands the element of time, in which losses may happen and fluctuations may take place shall be cut off and as far as possible annihilated with space. That is his object. Hence it is that the movement of commerce in this country is from east to west, and largely by railroads, because they save time, eliminate loss, and enable the merchant to calculate his small percentages on his great transactions.

The result of this mercantile system under a great law of nature is that men day after day are obtaining at the least cost the products of the whole world. Look at the result upon one single railroad. I noticed the other day, in the report of the Chicago, Milwaukee and Saint Paul Railroad, some simple figures, to which I ask the attention of the committee. In 1865 every ton per mile cost 4.11 cents; in 1875 every ton per mile cost 2.10 cents; in 1885 it cost 1.28 cents. There is a law here visible which is working inevitably to the benefit of the consumer, working without the cognizance and apparently without the knowledge of Congress, if one could judge from speeches of members. These great laws of trade keep on without us, and we need not attempt here, by this bill, to make a change in them, because the result will be in this Mississippi part that we shall be only throwing away our money not in a change, but in a futile attempt to make a change.

If gentlemen on the other side believe that this Mississippi River improvement is a thing which is worth its cost, why do they not sit down, like patient and sensible men, and appropriate the money necessary to complete the experiment in one of these reaches, so that we may understand once for all whether it will be a failure or not? If we know what one reach costs we can then calculate the whole cost. But if the object is the mere spending of money in one locality, what better way of doing it can there be than this to get us involved in an expenditure extending over 1,500 miles of distance, with apparently no other purpose than to continue it until it reaches an enormous sum?

I am well aware that the public mind is filled with that old idea of the great highway of commerce. It is astonishing how this mouth-filling language doth beguile the people. Let us sit down and look at it with sense in our heads and light in our eyes, and ask ourselves if we are willing year after year to incur the opprobrium of the country by adding this sum to our bill without any more proof of its righteousness and its wisdom. Let us cut loose this great question from the general river and harbor appropriation bill and let it stand upon its own merits—it is big enough to do it—if there are merits in it. Surely this is a wise course. If we still intend to keep it in the general river and harbor bill, let us confine it to an appropriation for a single reach. Let us try the experiment, even though, as my friend from Chicago [Mr. DUNHAM] well says, the grain will want to go the other way. But if you gentlemen think otherwise, and I am bound to yield deference to the judgment of so many of you, let us see if the experiment we are undertaking is going to be a success, and not throw money away on an uncertainty. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. There are three minutes' time still allowed to the opponents of the bill.

Mr. HEWITT. I wish to ask the chairman about the provision which I find in the bill (page 6, line 128) by which it appears that a

marine hospital in the State of Pennsylvania is to be ceded to the United States. I did not know that a marine hospital was part of the river and harbor bill; but I suppose the chairman can explain the nature of this provision.

Mr. WILLIS. If the gentleman would read it over just once more I do not think he would ask the question. It is not a ceding of a marine hospital, but it is a provision to obtain from the marine hospital at Erie the title to the peninsula of Presque Isle, in order that the Government may own the property that it is improving.

Mr. HEWITT. Is not this part of a scheme that has been several times before the House, by which the whole of that property is to be ceded to the United States?

Mr. WILLIS. Not that I know of.

Mr. HEWITT. Does the gentleman know that it is not?

Mr. WILLIS. I know nothing about it except what I state. The Government is asked to improve that part of the navigable water in front of Erie, and before doing so it was thought prudent that the marine hospital, which was said to have certain rights there, should be required to surrender them.

Mr. HEWITT. I have risen for the purpose of giving notice to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that when this item is reached I hope he will be prepared to give the House some explanation of this provision, by which the United States is to come into possession of a certain marine hospital under an act of the Legislature of Pennsylvania. I think it is an old friend which comes up again in a new form.

Mr. WILLIS. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN. The time fixed by the House for general debate has expired. The bill will now be read by paragraphs for amendment.

The Clerk, reading the bill by paragraphs, read as follows:

Improving harbor at York, Me.: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

An amendment reported by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, striking out the words "continuing improvement," was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that this bill can not be completed to-day, and I wish to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether he is willing that the committee shall now rise.

Mr. WILLIS. We are willing to hold on as long as the Committee of the Whole is disposed to continue the consideration of the bill, but if it is the general desire, I shall not object to the committee now rising.

Several MEMBERS. Rise! Rise!

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, before making the motion, however, I will ask leave to have printed in the RECORD the report of the committee upon this bill, as the supply seems to be exhausted.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The report is as follows:

Mr. WILLIS, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, submitted the following report, to accompany bill H. R. 7480:

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors beg leave to report back to the House the accompanying bill (H. R. 7480) "making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," with sundry amendments, and to recommend the passage of the same.

The last river and harbor act, which was passed 5th July, 1884, as it left the House appropriated \$12,619,100, upon estimates by the engineers that \$35,301,885 could be "profitably expended in the fiscal year," or 33 per cent of the estimates. The bill reported herewith appropriates \$15,120,700, upon the engineers' estimates of \$42,332,100.

#### PRINCIPAL ITEMS OF THE BILL.

The following is an itemized statement of the appropriations recommended in this bill:

165 rivers.....	\$9,922,700
124 harbors.....	4,380,500
5 channels and inlets.....	262,500
2 ice-harbors.....	35,000
5 breakwaters.....	215,500
4 special surveys.....	139,500
1 dry-dock.....	65,000
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies.....	100,000

15,120,700

Of this total amount the sum of \$1,018,000 covers items not carried upon the Book of Estimates. Deducting this last sum from the total, as given above, leaves \$14,102,700 as the amount appropriated upon the regular estimates, which is less than 33 per cent. thereof.

#### NUMBER OF ITEMS REJECTED—NEW ITEMS.

The estimates called for appropriations for 201 rivers (including 8 channels and inlets). Of these the committee rejected 40. They also called for appropriations for 138 harbors (including 5 breakwaters and 2 ice-harbors). Of these the committee rejected 15. Thus, out of a total of 339 items for which appropriations were asked by the engineers, 55 have been refused by the committee. The principal new item is an appropriation of \$250,000 for the construction of a new lock on the Saint Mary's River, which is the outlet for the great lake system. The immense increase of commerce on the lakes and the increased draught of vessels passing through this river fully justify the proposed work.

#### THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND ESTIMATES.

The largest appropriation in the bill is for the Mississippi River. The committee have appropriated to that river, from its mouth to its source, \$3,725,000. This amount includes \$50,000 for the reservoirs at its headwaters. An itemization of this aggregate sum is as follows:

Reservoirs at headwaters.....	\$50,000
Snag-boat on Upper Mississippi.....	30,000
From Saint Paul to Des Moines Rapids.....	510,000
At Des Moines Rapids, to complete modified project.....	35,000
From Des Moines Rapids to mouth of Illinois River.....	200,000

From mouth of Illinois River to mouth of Ohio River.....	500,000
From Cairo to the Head Passes, including Red River at and below the head of the Atchafalaya.....	2,250,000
Survey of Mississippi River between Head Passes and headwaters.....	75,000
To remove obstructions, &c.....	75,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>3,725,000</b>

The estimates for above items were as follows:

Reservoirs at headwaters.....	150,000
Snag-boat on Upper Mississippi.....	30,000
From Saint Paul to Des Moines Rapids.....	1,500,000
At Des Moines Rapids, to complete modified project.....	101,700
From Des Moines Rapids to mouth of Illinois River.....	500,000
From mouth of Illinois River to mouth of Ohio River.....	1,000,000
From Cairo to the Head Passes, including Red River at and below the head of the Atchafalaya.....	5,000,000
Survey of Mississippi River, between Head Passes and headwaters.....	100,000
To remove obstructions, &c.....	161,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>8,542,700</b>

In addition to the Mississippi, other great rivers in the country receive the following amounts:

Missouri River.....	\$610,000
Ohio River.....	500,000
Columbia River.....	460,000
Saint Mary's River and Hay Lake Channel.....	400,000
Tennessee River.....	357,500
Kentucky River.....	250,000
Delaware River.....	240,000
James River.....	150,000
Great Kanawha River.....	150,000
Cape Fear River.....	125,000
Monongahela River.....	121,500
Cumberland River.....	112,500
Illinois River.....	100,000
Red River.....	95,000
Arkansas River.....	75,000
Fox River.....	75,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>3,831,500</b>

#### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SMALLER RIVERS.

There are in the present bill recommendations for other rivers, as follows:

20 at \$5,000 each.....	\$100,000
18 at \$10,000 each.....	180,000
7 at \$15,000 each.....	105,000
30 between \$20,000 and \$50,000.....	857,500
2 at \$50,000.....	100,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,372,500</b>

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR HARBORS AS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL.

For harbors, &c., the recommendations of the bill are as follows:

2 ice-harbors, at.....	\$35,000
5 breakwaters, at.....	215,500
124 harbors, at.....	4,380,500
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>4,631,000</b>

The following are the leading appropriations for harbors:

New York Harbor (Hell Gate, &c.).....	\$435,000
Galveston Harbor.....	400,000
Sabine Pass, Texas.....	285,000
Charleston Harbor.....	250,000
Mobile Harbor.....	120,000
Baltimore Harbor.....	100,000
Norfolk Harbor.....	150,000
Cumberland Sound.....	150,000
Toledo Harbor.....	150,000
Savannah Harbor.....	125,000
Cleveland Harbor.....	125,000
Chicago Harbor.....	100,000
Aransas Pass.....	135,000
Sand Beach Harbor.....	100,000
Humboldt Harbor.....	100,000
<b>Total for fifteen harbors.....</b>	<b>2,705,000</b>

The following harbors are recommended for appropriations ranging from \$50,000 to \$100,000:

Oswego.....	\$95,000
Milwaukee.....	80,000
Oakland.....	80,000
Yaquina Bay.....	80,000
Wilmington.....	75,000
Boston.....	75,000
Newburyport.....	50,000
Erie.....	50,000
Pass Cavallo.....	50,000
Brazos Santiago.....	50,000
Duluth.....	50,000
<b>Total amount for eleven harbors.....</b>	<b>735,000</b>

In addition to the above there are fifteen harbors, for which recommendations have been made, ranging between \$20,000 and \$50,000, amounting in the aggregate to \$420,000.

#### SUMMARY OF HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Fifteen harbors, at \$100,000 and upward.....	\$2,705,000
Eleven harbors, from \$50,000 to \$100,000.....	735,000
Fifteen harbors, at and above \$20,000.....	420,000

#### TWO RIVER AND HARBOR BILLS IN ONE.

Your committee think it proper to call attention to the fact that the present bill carries appropriations for two years. The last appropriation for rivers and harbors was by the act of July 5, 1884, which was for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1885. In the last session of the Forty-eighth Congress the Committee on Rivers and Harbors reported a bill recommending the appropriation of \$12,323,700. This bill was discussed for several weeks, when another bill, appropriating \$3,000,000, was substituted for it and passed the House, but failed in the Senate from want of time to consider it. The deliberate judgment of the representatives of the people was thus placed upon record that at least \$3,000,000 was actually needed "for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain works on rivers and harbors for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886."

The failure to secure this or any amount for such purposes excited great complaint, and when this committee commenced their work at the beginning of the present session they were confronted with numerous demands for immediate appropriations. The committee did not think it proper to yield to these demands, but they embrace in the present bill the total amount to be expended for the next fiscal year. The failure of the last House to make any appropriation has thrown on your committee the duty of combining two river and harbor bills in one.

Dividing the present amount recommended between the two fiscal years will give \$7,500,000 as the amount of the present bill properly chargeable to this Congress.

No appropriation has been made for the improvement of the Potomac River and flats for the reason that the title to the reclaimed land is in dispute; and, until some satisfactory information on that subject has been furnished, it was not thought prudent to expend money in that direction.

#### GENERAL LEGISLATION.

The general legislation of the bill is confined to three or four provisions, touching the control, administration, use, and navigation of rivers and harbors. A report is required as to locks and dams now improved under authority, upon which tolls are charged, and as to the advisability of purchasing said improvements by the Government; and in one instance, that of the Monongahela River, the Government is authorized, if necessary, to acquire by condemnation the works of the Monongahela Navigation Company, to the end that the navigation of the river may be made free.

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS AND THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

The report of the Mississippi River Commission, together with the annual report and maps of the Chief of Engineers, are required to be made on or before the 1st of December in each year. In the annual report of the Chief of Engineers he is directed to report—

"All the instances in which piers, breakwaters, or other structures or works, built or made by the United States in aid of commerce or navigation, are used, occupied, or injured by a corporation or an individual, and the extent and mode of such use, occupation, or injury, and the facts touching the same. He shall also report whether any bridges, causeways, or structures, now erected or in process of erection, do or will interfere with the free and safe navigation of the rivers and other public works herein appropriated for, and if they do or will so interfere, to report the best mode of altering or constructing such bridges or causeways as to prevent any such obstructions."

#### CONTRACT SYSTEM PERMISSIBLE.

Another provision makes it the—

"Duty of the Secretary of War to apply the money herein appropriated for improvements, other than surveys and estimates, in carrying on the various works, by contract or otherwise, as may be most economical and advantageous to the Government. Where said works are done by contract, such contract shall be made after sufficient public advertisement for proposals, in such manner and form as the Secretary of War shall prescribe; and such contract shall be made with the lowest responsible bidder, accompanied by such securities as the Secretary of War shall require, conditioned for the faithful prosecution and completion of the work according to such contract, and for the prompt payment of all liabilities incurred in the prosecution thereof for labor and material."

#### OBSTRUCTING BRIDGES AND CAUSEWAYS.

Your committee have also recommended legislation touching the removal of bridges, causeways, and other structures which interfere with the free and convenient navigation of rivers and harbors, and providing that hereafter the drawings and description of such proposed works shall first be submitted to the Secretary of War for his approval.

#### SURVEYS AND EXAMINATIONS.

Your committee have directed the Secretary of War, at his discretion, to cause examinations or surveys, or both, and estimates of costs of improvement proper, to be made of fifty-six rivers and twenty-eight harbors. The wise provision of the act, placing these examinations and surveys under the supervision of the Secretary of War, and prescribing the conditions precedent thereto, have been adopted and made fuller and more specific in the present bill.

Before any money is ordered the local engineer is required to make a preliminary examination, and report to the Chief of Engineers—

"Whether, in his opinion, said river or harbor is worthy of improvement, and shall state in such report fully and particularly the facts and reasons on which he bases such opinion, including the present and prospective demands of commerce; and it shall be the duty of the Chief of Engineers to direct the making of such survey, if in his opinion the river or harbor proposed to be surveyed be worthy of improvement by the General Government, and he shall report to the Secretary of War the facts, and what public necessity or convenience may be subserved thereby, together with the full reports of the local engineer."

Such reports will place Congress in possession of all the facts, and prevent either partiality or prejudice.

Your committee finally recommend that such reports of preliminary examinations and surveys shall be made to this House and shall be printed. At present these reports are sent to the Senate, and the committee primarily charged with their consideration are thus frequently deprived of important and necessary information.

Your committee confidently believe that Congress will adopt these several legislative recommendations, as they are all approved by the Engineer Department, and have for their sole object the honest, faithful, and economical administration of the public moneys, and the proper regulation, maintenance, and construction of those great public works whose importance to commerce and navigation has been recognized from the foundation of our Government.

#### CONCLUSION.

Your committee, in bringing this report to a conclusion, can not refrain from briefly referring to the unusual and embarrassing circumstances under which the bill now reported was framed, and the efforts which they have made to discharge acceptably the arduous and responsible duties devolved upon them. The fact, already alluded to, that two river and harbor bills are embraced in the present bill, will suggest the increased responsibility, difficulty, and embarrassment in apportioning this small amount among a large number of works of improvement equally meritorious and important.

In discharging this duty your committee have availed themselves of all the information within their reach. Not only have the committee twice carefully considered all the facts contained in the special and general reports of the War Department, but every Member and Delegate was invited to appear, and over nine-tenths of them did appear and present additional facts touching the improvements within their respective districts. Numerous delegations, representing different works, were also heard.

Conscious that in the investigation of so many hundred public works, new and old, they may have in some instances done injustice, but trusting that in the main the conclusions arrived at will be found to be correct, the committee submit this bill as the result of their labors, with the hope that it will meet with the approval of Congress and of the country.

Mr. WILLIS. I move that the committee now rise.



The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WELLBOEN, from the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7480) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### RELATIONS OF LABOR AND CAPITAL.

The SPEAKER announced the following-named members as the Select Committee to investigate the causes of the existing disturbed condition of the relations between railroad companies engaged in interstate commerce and their employes in certain States:

A. G. CURTIN, of Pennsylvania; J. N. BURNES, of Missouri; W. H. CRAIN, of Texas; J. H. OUTHWAITE, of Ohio; J. W. STEWART, of Vermont; A. X. PARKER, of New York; and JAMES BUCHANAN, of New Jersey.

#### LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a number of gentlemen, I ask unanimous consent for any member who desires to print in the RECORD remarks on the river and harbor bill.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. J. W. STEWART, for one week from this date, on account of important business.

To Mr. TURNER, indefinitely.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KING moved that the House adjourn, but withdrew the motion at the request of Mr. GAY.

#### ALTARS ADMITTED FREE OF DUTY.

Mr. GAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up House bill No. 4007 and put it upon its passage. It will take but a moment.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to admit free of import duty, at the custom-house in New Orleans, La., a set of altars for the Catholic church of Saint John the Evangelist, of the parish of La Fayette, imported by Rev. Ernest Forge, priest of said church, and M. T. Martin, P. Gerard, and Louis Gus Breaux, trustees of said church, and consigned to J. Nugrue, of New Orleans, La.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GAY moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### ELECTORAL COUNT BILL.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I reported the electoral count bill I forgot to ask leave that the views of the minority might be printed with the report of the committee. I now make that request.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BLANCHARD: Petition of Mrs. Josephine Carlin, of Louisiana, praying compensation for quartermaster's stores taken by the Union forces during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Josephine Carlin, of Terre Bonne Parish, Louisiana—to the same committee.

By Mr. BLAND: Petition of William T. Coleman and others, for tariff on borax and borates—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAGG: Papers relating to the claim of Catherine Odlam—to the same committee.

By Mr. BURNES: Petition in support of House bill 7740—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BUTTERWORTH: Petition of Jacob Goetz, for relief and restoration to pension-roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Phil. Erkel, of Cincinnati, Ohio, with accompanying papers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: Memorial of Knights of Labor of Baltimore, against the passage of the free-ship bill—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

By Mr. CRAIN: Petition of H. Stevens, of Brazoria County, Texas, for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CUTCHEON: Memorial of civil employes of the Quartermaster General's Department, in regard to the Army bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of civilian employes of the supply department of the Army, in regard to certain limitations contained in the bill for the support of the Army known as the Army appropriation bill—to the same committee.

Also, petition of citizens of Muskegon, Mich., asking for the submission of a constitutional amendment to protect women in the enjoyment of suffrage in the States and Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORSEY: Petition of the officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Nebraska, asking for submission of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution—to the same committee.

By Mr. DUNHAM: Petition of the Chicago Live Stock Exchange, favoring legislation to relieve the hog-product of the United States against the unjust discrimination by foreign governments—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ERMENTROUT: Memorial against the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EVERHART: Petition of citizens of Chester County, Pennsylvania, praying for a constitutional amendment prohibiting the sale, &c., of all intoxicating beverages—to the Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GAY: Papers relating to the claim of Antoine La Forest, of La Fourche Parish, Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILFILLAN: Memorial of Minneapolis monthly meeting of Friends of Minnesota, in favor of the bill to promote peace among nations—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. R. S. GREEN: Petition of citizens of New Jersey, in favor of post-office savings-banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of Frank E. Lawyer and 98 others, citizens of Greensborough, Vt., in favor of taxing the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HANBACK: Petition of Knights of Labor of Kirwin, Kans., praying for the construction by the United States of a double-track railway from New York to Kansas City—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a letter from William Baird, of Vesper, Lincoln County, Kansas, relative to legislation in behalf of soldiers of the Union in the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: Petition on expenses in the post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. F. A. JOHNSON: Petition of William Dempsey and others, of Franklin County, New York, for modification of existing laws so as to allow citizens living near the line to take their grain to mills in Canada to be ground and bring the flour and meal back into the States without paying duty thereon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. J. T. JOHNSTON: Petition of J. D. Galleher and 66 others, soldiers and citizens of Warren County; of E. M. Slottleman and 104 others, soldiers and citizens of Guernsey County; of soldiers and citizens of Wabash County, of Pike County, of Ford County, of Vermillion County, and of Sullivan County, Indiana, asking for the passage of House bill No. 3320, pensioning all Union soldiers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Local Assembly No. 2281, Knights of Labor, of Terre Haute, Ind., in relation to public lands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Thomas K. Cushman, lieutenant Company I, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, asking for arrears of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Local Assembly No. 318, Knights of Labor, of Knights-ville, Ind.; of Local Assembly No. 299, Knights of Labor, of Clay County; and of Local Assembly No. 456, Knights of Labor, of Carbon, Ind., asking for relief of labor—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, petition of Knights of Labor of Cardonia, Ind., against the free-ship bill—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

Also, petition of Dr. W. H. Gillam, and 30 others, citizens of Parke County, Indiana, relating to public health—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LANG: Memorial of Knights of Labor Local Assembly No. 4638, of Bridgewater, Mass., in aid of the Hennepin Canal—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Memorial of the Woman's National Indian Association of Newark, N. J., and other citizens, asking for the passage of the Dawes Sioux bill—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: Petition of Knights of Labor of Grand Rapids, Mich., in favor of the construction of the Hennepin Canal—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. O'HARA: Petition of citizens of Fayetteville, N. C., asking for a term of United States court, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of Knights of Labor of Auburn, N. Y., in favor of the passage of the Hennepin Canal bill—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, remonstrance of Knights of Labor of Auburn, N. Y., against the passage of the free-ship bill—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

By Mr. PERKINS: Communication from the president of the board of education of Cherryvale, Kans., and the president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and others, for the passage of the temperance educational bill—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. PRICE: Petition of John W. Haldeman and 88 others, citizens of Taylor County, Wisconsin, for the passage of the bill recommended by the national pension committee of the Grand Army of the Republic—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. T. B. REED: Petition of the Maine branch of the Woman's National Indian Association, in favor of Senate bill No. 52—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SENEY: Protest of Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce against bridging the Ohio River at Cairo as proposed by Senate bill 1718 and House bill 6047—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SEYMOUR: Petition of 54 members of Local Assembly No. 2116 of Knights of Labor, of Atlantic City, Iowa, against the passage of the free-ship bill—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of Local Assembly No. 2511, Knights of Labor, of Pekin, Ill., against the free-ship bill—to the same committee.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of John P. Fraley, to be placed on the pension-roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. H. WARD: Petition of Local Assemblies Nos. 522 and 4670, Knights of Labor, of Chicago, against the free-ship bill—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

Also, memorial of Knights of Labor Local Assemblies Nos. 522 and 1307, of Chicago, Ill., in favor of the construction of the Hennepin Canal—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of James W. Rudgeforth, asking that his claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOODBURN: Six petitions of 237 citizens of Idaho Territory, praying for the passage of the bill introduced by Mr. WOODBURN, of Nevada, for the extirpation and suppression of polygamy in the Territories—to the Committee on the Territories.

The following petitions, praying Congress for the enactment of a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools of the District of Columbia, in the Territories, in the Military and Naval Academies, and in the Indian and colored schools supported wholly or in part by money from the national Treasury, were presented and severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. G. E. ADAMS: Of citizens of Cook County, Illinois.

By Mr. T. M. BROWNE: Of citizens of Wayne and Henry Counties, Indiana.

By Mr. GLASS: Of citizens of Obion County, Tennessee.

By Mr. HANBACK: Of citizens of Osborne, Rooks, Jewell, and Mitchell Counties, Kansas.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, April 16, 1886.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills, received yesterday from the House of Representatives, were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance:

A bill (H. R. 444) to amend section 3336 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and

A bill (H. R. 7465) to amend section 3357 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by section 2 of the act of June 9, 1880, and section 3389 of said Revised Statutes as amended by section 16 of the act of March, 1879.

The bill (H. R. 5789) to amend section 2552 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (H. R. 6637) relating to contested elections, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a memorial of Knights of Labor of Toledo, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade and Transportation of Cincinnati, Ohio, remonstrating against the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Cairo, Ill., as contemplated by Senate bill 1718 and House bill 6047; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DAWES presented petitions of Knights of Labor of Georgetown and Lynn, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the construction by the Government of the Hennepin Canal; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DOLPH presented a petition of citizens of Lewiston, Idaho, praying for the annexation of Northern Idaho to Washington Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. PLATT presented a petition of Knights of Labor of Tariffville, Hartford County, Connecticut, praying for the construction by the Government of the Hennepin Canal; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of Knights of Labor of Bath, Me., praying that liberal appropriations be made for public works of internal improvement, and especially for the construction by the Government of a harbor of refuge at Sandy Bay, Rockport, Mass.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HARRIS presented a memorial of Knights of Labor of Madison County, Tennessee, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. ALLISON presented a memorial of Knights of Labor of Atlantic, Iowa, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of citizens of Pennsylvania praying for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Pennsylvania praying for the appointment of a commission of inquiry concerning the alcoholic liquor traffic; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Pennsylvania praying for the adoption of a constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors throughout the national domain; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. COKE. I present a petition signed by ten or twelve colored people of Groveton, Trinity County, Texas, praying for the passage of a bill appropriating not exceeding \$100 per capita, to be expended under the direction of the American Colonization Society, in paying the expenses of emigrants to Liberia and in providing there six months' shelter and support of themselves and children. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER presented a petition of citizens of Sidney Plains, N. Y., praying for the passage of a law taxing imitations of butter; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PALMER presented a petition of Knights of Labor of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for the construction by the Government of the Hennepin Canal and other internal improvements; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of 167 Knights of Labor of Colquhoun; a memorial of 70 Knights of Labor of Ionia, and a memorial of 117 Knights of Labor of Mount Clemens, in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of 450 Knights of Labor of Springfield, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PLUMB presented a memorial of Knights of Labor of Minersville, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Kansas, praying for the passage of a bill providing for the organization of the Territory of Oklahoma; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Knights of Labor of Kirwin, Kans., praying that the Government purchase or construct an experimental double-track railroad from the city of New York to Kansas City, Mo.; which was referred to the Committee on Railroads.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Wyandotte County, Kansas, praying for the passage of a bill embodying the recommendations of the national pension committee of the Grand Army of the Republic in regard to pensions; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BUTLER presented the petition of William H. F. Lee, of Fairfax County, Virginia, praying for the removal of his political disabilities; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DOLPH, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4670) granting to the county of Clatsop, in the State of Oregon, the right to construct a bridge across Young's Bay, a navigable stream in said county and State, reported it with amendments.

Mr. HARRIS. For the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS], the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, who is now absent, and in his name, I report from that committee the bill (S. 851) to amend the charter of the Metropolitan Railroad Company with amendments, and I ask that it be placed on the Calendar.